

LEVEL
ONE

The Church Quarterly Review

Edited by Philip Usher

No. 237

OCTOBER 1934

Vol. CXIX

CONTENTS

	Page.
I. MESSIANIC PROPHECY AND EXTRA-ISRAELITE BELIEFS. By W. O. E. OESTERLEY	I
II. OUR LORD'S COMMAND TO PERPETUATE THE EUCHARIST. By W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON	12
III. LOLLARDY. By H. MAYNARD SMITH	30
IV. CHURCH AND STATE IN TERTULLIAN. By FRANK H. HALLOCK	61
V. THE SPIRIT IN THE PAULINE EPISTLES. By F. C. SYNGE	79
VI. EXTERNALS OF CHURCH WORSHIP AND CHURCH GOVERNMENT IN SCOTLAND UNDER CHARLES II. By G. D. HENDERSON	94
CANTERBURY ADMINISTRATION. By E. F. JACOB	112
QUERIES ON THE PRAYER BOOK. By THE BISHOP IN NORTH CHINA	125
REVIEWS	132
SHORT NOTICES	153
PERIODICALS AND BOOKS RECEIVED	165

THE CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW

14, BURLEIGH STREET

LONDON, W.C.2.

PRICE 6s. A COPY. SUBSCRIPTION PRICE 20s. PER ANNUM, POST FREE



HEATON, BUTLER AND BAYNE
GLASS PAINTERS
14 GARRICK STREET
LONDON W.C.

PRIZE
MEDALS
AT
LONDON
&
PARIS
SIDNEY
PHILADELPHIA
ETC.



MEMORIAL
WINDOWS AND BRASSES
MURAL DECORATION
MOSAICS ETC.
ILLUSTRATED LIST OF COMMISSIONS IN ALL PARTS OF THE
WORLD WHERE MEDALS MAY BE SEEN WILL BE
FORWARDED ON APPLICATION

and New York.

COMMUNION WINES

(Certified).

THE LARGEST SHIPPERS IN GREAT BRITAIN.

J. G. FORD & SON, Ltd.

ESTABLISHED 1838.

**Sedley Place, Nr. New Bond Street
OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.1**

Telephone—MAYFAIR 5135.

VINO SANTODENS

ALL COMMUNION WINES GUARANTEED THE
PURE JUICE OF THE GRAPE ONLY.

36/-, 38/-, 42/- per doz. bottles.

21/-, 22/-, 24/- per doz. ½-bottles.

Carriage paid on all orders of 1 dozen bottles or 2 dozen ½-bottles.

Samples and Price Lists free on application.

The Church Quarterly Review Advertiser

OCTOBER 1934

Advertisements for the C.Q.R. should be sent to 14 Barleigh Street, London, W.C.2

From MOWBRAYS' List

JUST PUBLISHED.

THE CHRISTIAN PRIEST OF TO-DAY. Lectures in Pastoral Theology, delivered in the University of Durham, 1933. By the Rev. C. E. OSBORNE, M.A., Litt.D., Rector of Wallsend, Hon. Canon of Newcastle, Hon. Chaplain to the Bishops of Durham and Newcastle. With a preface by THE BISHOP OF Durham. 5s.

Canon Osborne is a scholar and thinker who has spent nearly fifty years in the parochial ministry, mostly in industrial parishes in the North of England. His advice will be of the greatest value to the ordinand, and not less perhaps to the young priest or deacon.

PILLARS OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH. Seventeen Addresses broadcast from London by the Rev. A. C. DEANE, Canon of Windsor; the Rev. S. C. CARPENTER, Master of the Temple; Professor C. E. RAVEN; and Prebendary H. F. B. MACKAY. 4s. 6d.

Biographical studies of sixteen eminent Churchmen, including Jeremy Taylor, Charles Simeon, Frederick Denison Maurice, Archbishop Frederick Temple, Robert Dolling, and Henry Scott Holland.

THE MEANING OF MASS. Dogmatic and Devotional Considerations upon the Divine Liturgy. By the Rev. BEDE FROST. Author of "Priesthood and Prayer," etc. 3s. 6d. (Post 3d.)

A practical and devotional treatise on the Eucharist in the form of a commentary on the Roman Mass, which in the author's opinion expresses better than any other liturgy the mind of Western Christendom.

THE IMMORTAL GARLAND. A Book of Women Saints. By GEORGINA HOME. Cloth, 5s.

These Lives of twenty-five women saints, selected from various periods of the Church's history, are based on sound scholarship and written in an attractive manner for popular reading.

PASTORAL WORK AMONG CHILDREN. By the Rev. A. R. BROWNE-WILKINSON, Rector of Bedale, Yorks, formerly Principal of St. Christopher's College, Blackheath.

A valuable treatise for the parish priest and Sunday school teacher on varied aspects of work among children by an acknowledged expert in religious education.

THE PARISH PRIEST AS PREACHER. By the Rev. E. F. ODLING. Author of "The Pastor and His Guide." 1s. 6d. (Post 1½d.)

Practical suggestions on preaching based upon much thought and experience.

WOMEN AND THE LITURGICAL MINISTRY. By the Rev. KENNETH D. MACKENZIE, Canon of Salisbury. Author of "The Way of the Church," "The Faith of the Church." 1s. 6d. (Post, 1d.)

The object of this little book is to examine the suggestion or claim that women should be ordained to the liturgical ministry of the Church, whether in its completeness or with limitations.

C. OF E. WHAT DOES IT STAND FOR? A Primary Visitation Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of Bradford. By the Right Rev. A. W. F. BLUNT, D.D., Bishop of Bradford. Fourth Impression. 1s. 6d. (Post 1½d.)

"Strong and deliberate assertions of the Church's faith and practice, combined with wise, positive and courageous rulings and suggestions for maintaining and establishing both."—*Church Times*.

"This Charge, as weighty as it is terse, should form a rallying point for large numbers of ordinary Churchpeople."—*Guardian*.

LORD HALIFAX. A tribute. By SIDNEY DARK. Author of S. Thomas of Canterbury," "Archbishop Lord Davidson," etc. Cloth, 2s. 6d. (Post 2½d.)

"The tribute is paid in a most readable manner."—*The Times Lit. Supplement*.
"This generous tribute to a great man, a great saint, and loyal Churchman, will receive a wide welcome."—Dr. Relton, in *Church of England Newspaper*.

A. R. MOWBRAY & CO., Ltd., 28, Margaret Street, Oxford Circus, London, W.1; and 9, High Street, Oxford.

STUDENT CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT PRESS

CONVICTIONS

A Selection from the Responses of the Churches to the Report of the World Conference on Faith and Order, held in Lausanne in 1927.

Edited by LEONARD HODSON, D.D., D.C.L., Canon of Winchester Cathedral.

8s. 6d. net.

This volume contains official statements representing forty-two different Churches in Europe, Asia, Africa, America and Australasia. It is believed that nowhere else is there to be found so comprehensive a collection of those differing Christian convictions which must somehow be reconciled if there is to be a genuinely reunited Christendom.

THE CHURCH CONTROVERSY IN GERMANY

The Position of the Evangelical Church in the Third Empire.

By ANDERS NYGREN, Professor in the University of Lund, Sweden. Translated by G. C. Richards, D.D., Canon of Durham.

2s. 6d. net.

A well authenticated and up-to-date account based not only on published documents but also on personal interviews with the chief actors on all sides.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS in GERMAN PROTESTANTISM

By DR. OTTO PIPER.

4s. net.

"No one who wishes to understand what is happening in the German soul should fail to read what Dr. Otto Piper has to say. It is far and away the most illuminating thing that has yet appeared in English."—*The Guardian*. Ready October 12th.

THE FATHER AND THE SON

By W. F. LOFTHOUSE, D.D., Principal of Handsworth College, Birmingham.

A Study of the central message of the Fourth Gospel.

7s. 6d. net.

58, Bloomsbury Street, London, W.C.1.

From BURNS OATES' List

THE BIBLE FOR EVERYDAY

ARCHBISHOP GOODIER

Cr. 8vo,

Cloth, 5/-

A series of 366 specially chosen extracts from the Bible to provide a reading for every day. Quite unlike any other collection of its kind.

ST. BENEDICT

ABBOT CABROL

Cr. 8vo,

Cloth, 5/-

This study of the great Founder of his Order by the Abbot of Farnborough, than whom no one is better qualified to tell the story of St. Benedict, will take its place at once as a classic.

THE HISTORY OF THE GREAT CHARTREUSE

Translated by E. HASSID

Illustrated

Demy 8vo,

12/6

Regarded by the Carthusians as the standard history of their Order. Its detailed description of the monastic buildings and monastic life will be of interest to a wide public.

ROME AND REUNION

Edited by E. C. MESSENGER, Ph.D.

Cr. 8vo,

Cloth, 3/6

A series of most important pronouncements by recent Popes on the question of Reunion. Most of them are directly concerned with the "Anglo-Catholic" claims. The series includes Pope Leo XIII's letter to the English people, which is unobtainable elsewhere.

43, NEWGATE STREET, LONDON, E.C.1,

and from all Booksellers.

Send for Illustrated Autumn List.

THE MODERNIST MOVEMENT IN THE ROMAN CHURCH

Its Origins and Outcome. By A. R. VIDLER

12s. 6d. net

"An outstanding success . . . Admirably written—clearly, temperately, knowledgeably and wisely."—*The Church Times*.

CHURCH LIFE UNDER EDWARD III

By K. L. WOOD-LEGH

Studies in Medieval Life and Thought. 10s. 6d. net

This work adds considerably to our knowledge of the life of the Church during a particular period, and illustrates the great importance of the Chancery Enrolments to the student of ecclesiastical history.

ORPHISM

By J. R. WATMOUGH. 3s. 6d. net

The Cromer Greek Prize Essay for 1934, in which the author shows that Orphism is no less characteristic of Greek thought than is the cult of the Olympian gods. He draws an analogy between ancient Orphism and modern Protestantism.

NEW TESTAMENT ETHICS

AN INTRODUCTION. By C. ANDERSON SCOTT

Second Edition. 5s. net

"A veritable feast of good things, these six lectures amply repay careful reading and study. *New Testament Ethics* is worthy of a place in anyone's library. Dr Anderson Scott has given us a rich contribution and maintained the high standard of the Hulsean Lectureship."—*The Church of England Newspaper*, on the first edition.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

KING'S COLLEGE

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON (DEPARTMENT OF THEOLOGY)

Dean—The Rev. R. HANSON, M.A., B.D.

FACULTY of THEOLOGY

The Degree of B.D. in the University can be obtained by Graduates in Arts after two years' study, by other Matriculated Students after three years.

Theology may also be taken as one subject for the General B.A. Examinations.

The Associateship of King's College is accepted by most Bishops as the academic qualification for admission to Holy Orders. It can be obtained by Graduates in Arts after two years' Theological study; by others who have passed certain examinations at school, or later, after three years' study; and by others after a year of Preliminary study and the three years' ordinary Theological course.

Post-graduate work in Theology for B.D. Hons., Ph.D. and D.D. is directed by each Professor.

There are Entrance Exhibitions both for Graduates and for other Students.

King's College Hostel, Vincent Square, Westminster, offers the advantages of residence.

Women Students are admitted to the Theological Department to read for the B.D. or the Lambeth Diploma (S.Th.).

Staff

DOGMATIC THEOLOGY AND EVIDENCES: Rev. HERBERT MAURICE RELTON, D.D., Professor.

HEBREW AND THE EXEGESIS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT: Rev. WILLIAM OSCAR EMIL OESTERLEY, M.A., D.D., Litt.D., Professor; SAMUEL HENRY HOOKE, M.A., B.D., Samuel Davidson Professor; Rev. FREDERICK JAMES HOLLIS, D.D., Lecturer.

SYRIAC, ARAMAIC AND RABBINICAL HEBREW: { Rev. WILLIAM OSCAR EMIL OESTERLEY, M.A., D.D., Litt.D., Professor; SAMUEL HENRY HOOKE, M.A., B.D., Samuel Davidson Professor; Rev. FREDERICK JAMES HOLLIS, D.D., Lecturer.

EXEGESIS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT: Rev. RANDOLPH VINCENT GREENWOOD TASKER, M.A., Head of Department; EDWYN R. BEVAN, M.A., D.Litt., LL.D., Hon. Lecturer.

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY: Rev. Canon CLAUDE JENKINS, D.D., F.S.A., Professor.

PATRISTIC TEXTS: Rev. Canon CLAUDE JENKINS, D.D., F.S.A., Lecturer; Rev. RANDOLPH VINCENT GREENWOOD TASKER, M.A., Lecturer.

PASTORAL AND LITURGICAL THEOLOGY: Rev. OSCAR HARDMAN, M.A., D.D., Professor; Rev. CLEMENT FRANCIS ROGERS, M.A., Professor Emeritus; Rev. WILLIAM BELL DAMS, M.A., Lecturer.

PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION: THE DEAN; Rev. Preb. A. CALDECOTT, D.D., D.Litt., Professor Emeritus; Rev. F. HAROLD SMITH, D.D., Lecturer in Comparative Religions.

ECCLESIASTICAL ART: Rev. Canon PERCY DEARMER, M.A., D.D., Hon. A.R.I.B.A., Professor.

TUTOR TO WOMEN STUDENTS OF THEOLOGY: Miss E. W. HIPPISELEY, S.Th.
CHAPLAIN: Rev. E. S. ABBOTT, B.A.

FEES	£32 a year
Evening Classes	£15 15s. 0d. a year
There is no entrance fee.							
For residence at Hostel	£66 a year

For full information apply to the DEAN, KING'S COLLEGE,
STRAND LONDON, W.C.2.

THE CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW

No. 237

OCTOBER 1934

VOL. CXIX

REVIEWS.

History of the Church of Ireland. Ed. by WALTER ALISON PHILLIPS, Litt.D., M.R.I.A., p. 132.—*Peter Sterry : Puritan and Platonist.* By VIVIAN DE SALES PINTO, p. 139.—*Natural Law and the Theory of Society, 1500 to 1800.* By OTTO GIERKE, p. 142.—*A New Argument for God and Survival.* By MALCOLM GRANT, p. 145.—*Civitas Dei.* By LIONEL CURTIS, p. 148.—*Christianity and Class War.* By NICHOLAS BERDYAEV, p. 149.

SHORT NOTICES.

The Call of Israel : an Introduction to the Study of Divine Election. By W. J. PYTHIAN-ADAMS, p. 153.—*The Social Triumph of the Ancient Church.* By S. J. CASE, p. 154.—*The Reformation in England : I. The English Schism, Henry VIII (1509-1547).* By G. Constant, p. 154.—*Calamy Revised.* By A. G. MATTHEWS, p. 156.—*The Doctrine of God.* By A. C. BOUQUET, D.D., p. 157.—*The Resurrection of the Body.* By OSCAR HARDMAN, M.A., D.D., p. 159.—*The Fall of Man. Its Place in Modern Thought.* By H. T. POWELL, DD., p. 160.—*This our Sacrifice.* By TREVOR JALLAND, p. 161.—*New Psychology and Old Religion.* By EDWARD F. MURPHY, S.S.J., Ph.D., p. 162.—EMIL BRUNNER : *Natur und Gnade. Zum Gespräch mit Karl Barth,* p. 163.

PERIODICALS AND BOOKS RECEIVED

165

RELIGION: ITS MODERN NEEDS AND PROBLEMS

A series of twenty books at one shilling each (by post 1/1).

Edited by R. V. HOLT, M.A., B.Litt., Oxon.

Includes the following issues:—

SCIENCE, PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION, by W. Lawrence Schroeder, M.A.
FUNDAMENTALS OF MODERN RELIGION, by R. F. Rattray, M.A., Ph.D.
PSYCHICAL RESEARCH AND RELIGION, by L. J. Belton, B.A., M.Sc.
MIRACLES AND MODERN KNOWLEDGE, by S. H. Mellone, M.A., D.Sc.
CHRISTIANITY AND SEX MORALITY, by E. G. Lee, B.A.
PROGRESS AND CHRISTIANITY, by Raymond V. Holt, M.A., B.Litt.

Send for prospectus with synopses of the individual books.

THE LINDSEY PRESS, 5, Essex Street, Strand, London, W.C.2.

—SKEFFINGTONS' NEW THEOLOGY—

IN SEASON and OUT of SEASON.

The **Very Rev. C. A. ALINGTON, D.D., Dean of Durham.**

A series of Fifty-two articles by the Dean of Durham, reprinted from the *Daily Telegraph*. These talks are both interesting and highly practical and will be welcomed by the Clergy and Laity generally.

Price 3/6 net (postage 3d.).

MORE LITTLE SERMONS.

Rev. L. B. ASHBY, M.A.

Another series of Fifty-two short Sermons for the Christian Year by this popular and well-known writer. The principal Church Seasons are included.

Price 3/6 net (postage 3d.).

MORE FAVOURITE HYMNS.

Rev. H. E. LANGHORNE.

A new series of delightful and instructive Addresses on twenty well-known hymns, including a few modern ones such as "O Valiant Hearts," by Sir John Arkwright. A brief account of the writer of each Hymn is given.

Price 3/6 net (postage 3d.).

THE JEWEL of TRUTH: and OTHER STORIES for CHILDREN.

Rev. PHILIP B. THORBURN.

A delightful series of talks to children, some for the Church Seasons and others on general subjects. The volume will be of great value for Children's Services, Sunday School Teachers, for Parents to read to children, or as a gift-book.

Price 2/6 net (postage 3d.).

JESUS FOR EVERYCHILD. R. GLADSTONE GRIFFITH, M.A.

The story of our Lord's Life and Teaching is told for boys and girls in the light of biblical scholarship and modern knowledge. The essence of the Christian Gospel is given from the historical point of view and free from those legendary and miraculous additions natural to bygone ages but irrelevant to our own.

Price 2/6 net (postage 3d.).

SPIRIT AND TRUTH.

Rev. E. G. NORRIS, M.A.

This book is written for the ordinary reader who wants to be taken back as closely as possible into the mind and outlook of Our Lord. It is a commentary on many of His Sayings, which he described as Spirit and Truth, from the actual language in which He spoke them—Aramaic. This gives a new light and a fresh interpretation upon them making clear many sayings accounted difficult.

Price 3/6 net (postage 2d.).

RELIGION AND THE WORLD DREAM.

Rev. RAYMOND C. KNOX,

This book shows how the great forces of the world are not those associated with finance or material wealth, but those principles of life and conduct which make for integrity and for service to mankind. The theme is very well worked out in the light of the world situation and thus is just the volume for all thinking people.

The Archdeacon of Oakham writes: "I warmly recommend this book."

Price 3/6 net (postage 3d.).

CONFIRMATION AND AFTER.

Preface by His Grace **THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK.**

Confirmation Addresses by the Bishops of **LONDON; ST. ALBANS; MANCHESTER; WORCESTER; RIPON; WAKEFIELD; BRISTOL; BARK. ING; and BISHOP BOUTFLOWER.** This beautifully produced little book forms a most suitable gift for Confirmation Candidates.

The Archbishop of York writes: "This book will probably help anyone, into whose hands it comes, to gain the full benefit of his or her Confirmation and to keep up the effort to live in the strength of it."

Peap 8vo. 2/6 net (postage 3d.).

New Autumn List sent post free on application.

SKEFFINGTON & SON, LTD., Paternoster House, St. Paul's, E.C.4.

THE
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW

No. CCXXXVII.—OCTOBER 1934

ART. I.—MESSIANIC PROPHECY AND EXTRA-
ISRAELITE BELIEFS.

I.

It is hardly necessary to insist that no branch of Old Testament study can be treated as if it were, so to speak, in a watertight compartment. Hebrew mythology, ritual, folklore, religion, archæology, literature, or whatever branch it may be, is always part and parcel of a larger whole. The Hebrew part can never be adequately apprehended unless it be studied in the light of its environment. The Hebrews were always in close touch with the peoples around them, and extraneous influences were constantly being brought to bear. So far as the people in general were concerned it is doubtful whether there was any period in pre-Christian times during which they were not in some measure subject to outside influences, and this will apply more especially to the domain of religion.

That in the religious sphere the Hebrews came in course of time to show an overwhelming superiority does not affect the truth that their beliefs developed from primitive forms which did not differ from those of other peoples. It is, therefore, natural enough that the study of Messianic prophecy in the Old Testament should in these days have entered into new spheres, the very existence of which was never contemplated by our forefathers. New knowledge from a variety of sources has given us a deeper insight into what lay behind the conceptions and teaching of prophets and psalmists when they spoke of him who was to be the Saviour of mankind.

Thanks to the new light shed on many familiar passages in the Old Testament through a fuller knowledge of Egyptian, Babylonian and Persian beliefs and rituals, which the work of excavators has given us, we are able to discern in the Old Testament indications of the presence there of conceptions which could not have been recognized without the aid of the extraneous literary material belonging to the countries surrounding Palestine.

It is conceded therefore to-day by many that the study of Messianic prophecy cannot be restricted to the Old Testament. Extra-Israelite beliefs, however alien to the Hebrew religious genius they may at first appear, have contributed their quota to the body of thought comprised in the phrase: "Messianic Prophecy," and have illustrated the prophet's conception of God, so world-embracing and above time and space: "Art not thou from everlasting, O Lord my God, mine Holy One"!

It is recognized, further, that eschatology, which is so intimately bound up with Messianic prophecy, covers a much larger area than the Old Testament; in the apocalyptic literature we have, on the one hand, the development of much of what occurs in the eschatology of the Old Testament; but also, on the other, a great deal of ancient material not alluded to in the Old Testament, but which was certainly part of traditional popular eschatology. It follows, therefore, that much of what is said on this subject in the Old Testament must be read in the light of the apocalyptic literature. In a word, the method of approach, and the general envisaging of the whole subject of Messianic prophecy, are somewhat different from what they were in days gone by.

We may start, therefore, with the recognition of the fact that the Messianism, under which are included Messianic and eschatological conceptions,—the Messianism of the Old Testament is not in its origin indigenous in Israel. It was the adaptation, development, and modification of earlier, extraneous thought, by the Hebrew prophets. But the question as to what

it was that lay behind the Messianism of the Hebrew prophets admits of differences of opinion.

In the light of the fuller knowledge of the religions and ritual of the ancient east which has for some time been available, and in the recognition—now generally admitted—that the Hebrews were much indebted to Egypt and Babylon for various elements in their religion and ritual, I venture to put forth the thesis that the eschatology of the Old Testament and the central figure in the eschatological drama are, in their origin, to be traced back to the Egyptian and Babylonian New Year Festival, *with all that this implied*; when I say, with all that this implied, I mean, primarily, the belief in the King-god and his functions.

At first sight that appears so improbable that I would not dare to suggest it but for the prophet's insistence that God is "from everlasting." For if this be true—and who will doubt it?—then we are forced to believe that God Almighty has from all time evinced his interest in his creation—man—in such a way as to accord to him some measure of self-revelation; and that self-revelation will be in accordance with man's capacity for apprehending him.

Further, it is not possible to believe that the divine self-revelation was ever intended to be restricted to any one people. If Israel happened to have been chosen as a temporary special instrument for this, it was merely that she was, for the time being, used as a vehicle for the dissemination of truth; and that, not for her own sake alone, as the prophets often taught. And, in any case, Israel appeared at quite a late date in human history; what about all the preceding millenniums? Can it be believed that God's interest in man only began in the fifteenth century B.C. When St. Paul recognized that the Athenians, in spite of all their crass beliefs, were seeking the one true God, he laid down a principle which is equally applicable to earlier ages,—What difference does a millennium or two make to the Almighty? The Egyptians and Babylonians were also seeking God, according to their lights; and there is nothing derogatory to the Almighty to affirm that to them also he vouchsafed some knowledge of the truth, so far as they were able to receive it.

The view now to be offered may be right, or it may be wrong, but it does contain some elements which are of interest—perhaps something more than mere interest—in connexion with the subject of Messianic prophecy.

II.

The eschatological drama as portrayed in the prophetic books of the Old Testament may be said to be concerned primarily with the “Day of the Lord,” and the central figure in that “Day.” A number of other elements, some of which have a long history behind them, while others are due to the Hebrew religious genius, came, in course of time, to occupy places in the drama; but what is of main and fundamental importance is the *Day*, and the *Central Figure*.

The nature of the expectations regarding the “Day of the Lord” is made clear by the well-known passage in Am. v, 18—20: “Woe unto you that desire the day of the Lord! Wherefore would ye have the day of the Lord? It is darkness, and not light . . . Shall not the day of the Lord be darkness, and not light? even very dark, and no brightness in it?” It is evident that the prophet endeavours here to correct what he conceives to be an erroneous idea regarding the “Day of the Lord” on the part of the people. His reiterated insistence that it will not be a day of light, that is, of happiness and prosperity, but of darkness, shows what the popular conception of the “Day of the Lord” was; so that their desire for its advent was natural enough. From the eighth century B.C. onwards the prophets pictured the “Day of the Lord” as a time of terror and gloom; this was due to their ethical teaching regarding the person and character of Yahweh, and to their horror of the sins of the people; they could not conceive of God’s presence among a sinful people; God would come, not to be among them, but to punish them. Clearly enough, there was every justification for a transmutation of the popular traditional expectation regarding that Day. But this must not prevent us from enquiring the reason for the popular desire for the coming of that Day, and why it was thought of as one of

prosperity and well-being. This it is that leads us to seek the origin of the conception of the "Day of the Lord."

For our first step, as we look back, we must turn to the Feast of Tabernacles, the New Year Festival among the ancient Hebrews, *the feast par excellence*, and the earliest of the agricultural feasts to be mentioned in the Old Testament. The observance of this feast, no doubt Canaanite, and taken over by the Hebrews, was based on the pattern of the New Year Spring Festival of Egypt and Babylonia; both of which would seem to go back to a common archetype.

The central *motif* in both the Egyptian and Babylonian festivals was that a supreme god—among the many in their respective pantheons—was worshipped in the *rôle* of productive creator; and the earthly king, as supreme among his people, and their protector, was identified with this supreme god.¹

Osiris among the Egyptians, and Marduk among the Babylonians, assumed this *rôle*, and in each case the earthly king was identified with his god. As we know from documentary evidence, during this annual New Year Festival the god was proclaimed king, homage being paid to him in his visible embodiment in the person of the earthly king; and this was graphically set forth in the ceremony of his ascent upon his throne, where he was worshipped as the acknowledged lord of Creation, and his creative power extolled; his presence among his people being the guarantee of the coming revival of Nature and of material blessings during the year. The ceremony, with various accompanying ritual acts, not only symbolized, but was also believed actually to bring about, the re-vivification of Nature. Its supreme importance, therefore, for the welfare, nay, for the very existence of the people, needs no emphasis.

What Osiris was to the Egyptians, and what Marduk was to the Babylonians, that Yahweh was to the Hebrews. The Hebrew annual New Year Festival, held on the first day of the Feast of Tabernacles, was the occasion on which, year by year,

¹ *Myth and Ritual*, Essays by various scholars, ed. by S. H. Hooke (Oxford, 1933).

the kingship of their God, Yahweh, was celebrated, and he was worshipped and honoured as the Lord of Creation. By his fiat—this was the belief of his worshippers—the produce of the soil for the coming year would be abundant, the flocks would increase, and prosperity and physical well-being would be the lot of the people.

Thus, there was annually a renewed manifestation of God's creative power and benevolence; so that every New Year Festival was a memorial of the Creation, since at each New Year Festival the land was believed to be re-created. We have definite evidence that the Jews discerned a relationship between the Feast of Tabernacles and the Creation; indeed, it may be said that, in their view, the New Year Festival was, as it were, a repetition of the Creation.

New Year's Day was, thus, in a very real sense, the *Day of Yahweh* for the people, the day on which their God was believed to be present among his people, when his creative power was shown forth, and sustenance for the coming year was guaranteed; so that it was a day of great rejoicing, for prosperity was ensured.

And then, by a process of reasoning which may not appear logical to us, but to which, as is well known, there are many parallels, the belief arose that the annual "Day of the Lord" was the harbinger and earnest of a great day which would usher in a Golden Age, as in primeval times; when Yahweh would come in person to establish the reign of peace, prosperity, and plenty, and would abide permanently among his people, and reign over them as their King. In other words, it assumed an eschatological content. Small wonder that, in the popular conception, that day was a Day of light, and was looked forward to as a time of well-being and happiness.

That it was a materialistic conception in which no thought of ethical righteousness entered will be readily understood by all who are in any way conversant with the mental attitude and religious beliefs of early peoples. It was only through the teaching of the Hebrew prophets that the hitherto purely unethical conceptions and expectations were transformed, and

the demand made that righteousness must be the condition of enjoying the favour of a righteous God, and of claiming the privilege of citizenship in his kingdom when it should come.

III.

And now we turn to examine a little more closely the varying conceptions held concerning the person of the central figure in this eschatological drama—as it has now become.

We have seen that in the original Egyptian and Babylonian conception the central figure in the New Year's Day Festival was the king, the divine king because identified with Osiris in the case of one, with Marduk in that of the other, the supreme god, respectively, of either. The god, in the person of the king, came as "Heilbringer," Saviour, dispensing the fruits of the earth, and saving from famine and death.

In Israel a similar belief obtained, as is reflected in the liturgical psalms sung during the Feast of Tabernacles. But thanks to the teaching of the prophets it was here not merely a question of material blessings, prominently as these appear, but also of spiritual gifts which were granted by their God, Yahweh, who was the central figure. But here arises the question as to whether, in Israel, the king was ever identified with the Deity, as among the Egyptians and Babylonians. This is stoutly denied by most authorities since, as it is claimed, there is no hint in the Old Testament that the king was ever deified. Even if it be granted that that is the case—which is by no means certain—one can readily understand why, under prophetic guidance, every effort would have been made to obliterate an idea which was of Gentile origin, and which was clearly repugnant to the higher religious conceptions of the Hebrew prophets. But inasmuch as there is abundant evidence to show that in other respects the Hebrew New Year Festival was based—no doubt through Canaan—on the Egyptian and Babylonian pattern, there is at least some justification for believing that at one time the Hebrews did conceive of the Deity being embodied in the king, or, in pre-monarchic days, in the head of the tribe or clan; the idea was certainly familiar to the prophet Ezekiel.

But however this may be, *Yahweh* was the *Central Figure* in the New Year Festival, which came to be looked upon as the earnest and, so to say, the forerunner of the great final Day of *Yahweh*, when he would come to rule, and when the Kingdom of God would be established on earth. This is the essence of the eschatological drama.

Nevertheless, we are more accustomed to regard as the *Central Figure* in the eschatological drama, the *Messiah*. It will not be questioned that the Old Testament conception of the Messiah, the anointed of the Lord—as every king in Israel was—was due to the prophets. We should, therefore, expect that there would be consistency of teaching in the prophetic writings regarding the Messiah. Why then is the presentation of the Messiah in those writings so variable? It will not be denied that the thought of the Messiah and the conception of the Kingdom of God belong together; and yet in most of the descriptions of the end of the present world-order and of the inauguration of the Kingdom of God in the older prophetic literature, the Messiah hardly figures at all. In these descriptions thought is so concentrated on the advent of God and the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth in which God himself will be the ruler, that no room is left for the figure of the Messiah. The same is true of a great deal of the later Jewish-hellenistic apocalyptic literature of the last two pre-Christian centuries. Nevertheless, there are, on the other hand, various passages in the Old Testament in which the *Messiah* occupies either the central position itself, or a very prominent one (Isaiah iv, 2-6; ix, 5, 6; xi, 1-5; Jer. xxiii, 5, 6; xxxiii, 15, 16; Zech. iii, 9, 10; vi, 12, 13). Similarly in the apocalyptic literature, especially in the later parts of it, the Messiah, represented as the son of David, appears as the central figure. And then, finally, at a still later period—that is, during the first Christian century—the Messiah as the son of David is, indeed, mentioned—for example, in the Jewish Liturgy—but he occupies a quite subordinate position in the Kingdom of God that is looked for: “Be King over us, thou Adonai alone.”

The primary point to be emphasized, then, is that both in the Old Testament, as well as in the Jewish apocalyptic literature, the figure and the rôle of the Messiah are variable. It would be wearisome, and indeed out of place here, to give detailed illustrations of what has been said. But one illustration from the Old Testament may be offered, for it presents us with the essence of the truth we are concerned to set forth. This illustration consists of four Messianic passages from the book of *Isaiah*; they all deal with the establishment of the Kingdom of God at the end of the present world-order, and they all depict the central figure in that Kingdom. In the first (ii, 2-4), which occurs also in Mic. iv, 1-3, the Messiah does not appear at all; it is Yahweh, God himself, who is the central figure, and who will teach the people his ways in those "latter days," and who will judge between the nations and reprove many peoples; so that there will be no more war, but peace on earth. God is therefore the central figure. In the second passage (iv, 2-6) Yahweh is again the ruler "in that day"; but, it is said, "the Branch of Yahweh," that is, his Messiah, will be beautiful and glorious; and God's presence will be indicated by the *Shekhinah*, "a cloud of smoke by day, and the shining of a flaming fire by night." The third passage (ix, 5, 6) depicts the *Messiah* as the central figure, and as a semi-divine ruler whose name shall be called: "Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace"; he will sit on the throne of David, and his kingdom will last "from henceforth even for ever"; "the zeal of the Lord of hosts shall perform this." And in the fourth passage (xi, 1-5) the *Messiah* appears again as the central figure, but now as a purely human ruler, of the stock of Jesse; but upon him the spirit of Yahweh will rest in a unique manner, "the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge, and of the fear of the Lord"; and when he reigns "the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea."

These varying conceptions of the central figure in the Kingdom that is to be set up in the latter days, could be further

illustrated from both the Old Testament and the apocalyptic literature; but it is unnecessary. The essential point is that it is taught that in the Kingdom of God the ruler is first thought of as God himself; later, the figure of the *Messiah* appears in this rôle of ruler; he is sometimes conceived of as God's anointed king, but purely human; at others as an earthly king especially endowed with the spirit of God; at yet others as semi-divine; and this continues throughout the history of Messianic thought among the Jews, prior to Christian times.

Now is it not possible that this presentation of the Messianic ruler sometimes as human and at others as super-human, may be the *prophetical adaptation* of the ancient Egyptian and Babylonian conception of the divine king—the Deity embodied in the earthly king? The prophets repudiated the idea of a deified king; but tentatively, at any rate, the thought arose that when the ideal king came—King Messiah—the spirit of God would so permeate his whole being that he would be God-like,—divine. They hesitated to identify him with God; yet they struggled to express what in that old King-God conception may have adumbrated a great truth; but they were unable to express it; hence their inconsistency in the presentation of the central figure in the Kingdom of God.

How it came about that among the Egyptians and Babylonians the king was regarded as divine, and why, is a profoundly interesting question which does not concern us now; the point is that they *did*; and from the final issue, as we see it in our Lord Jesus Christ, we are forced to admit that here we have a dim foreshadowing of an eternal truth—the King-Messiah, a man, yet truly divine.

To the thoroughgoing anthropologist and folklorist such a contention may sound ridiculous; but with a belief in God—given a belief in God—who, as the prophet rightly protests, is “from everlasting,” and who as the All-Creator cannot be indifferent to his creatures—whose presence, moreover, cannot be eliminated from the world, or from the universe, or from innumerable universes for that matter,—I say, with a belief in God, Almighty, Omniscient, Omnipresent, is there anything so

absurd in supposing that from earliest times, so far as man is concerned, God in his infinite love, was vouchsafing *some* knowledge of truth to man according to man's capacity for apprehending it? The ever-presence of God cannot have been without some influence, some effect on man, however circumscribed his intelligence; and every spark of divine self-revelation, however clumsily manipulated, was still a divine spark, and as such pregnant with light.

If there is any truth in this, then it can be affirmed that long before the advent of the Messiah, Jesus Christ, God and Man, men had, by divine inspiration, dimly discerned a truth, which neither then nor at any other time could be fully fathomed, but which, when the Son of God came on earth, was found, indeed, to be truth.

W. O. E. OESTERLEY.

ART. II.—OUR LORD'S COMMAND TO PERPETUATE
THE EUCHARIST.

UNTIL quite recent times it was a universal belief that the perpetuation of the Eucharist rested on the express direction given by our Lord to his apostles on the night of the institution. That belief has during the last century been called in question by certain students for critical reasons. Various Continental critics have adopted this negative view, and there are English critics who have arrived at the same conclusion.

Bernard Weiss, for instance, some fifty years ago, said without hesitation that the earliest tradition possessed no express command from Christ regarding the repetition of the breaking of the bread and the consecration of the cup; but the practice of the apostles recognised from the first that this was his intention.¹

Other critics have raised the objection that it is highly unlikely that Jesus, who had created no forms for the life of his community, should in such a critical hour have founded a religious rite.² Even Baptism is attributed to Christ after his resurrection, and it may very well be that the direction about the Eucharist had a similar origin, and that the words "Do this . . ." which St. Paul ascribes to Christ are a direction of the glorified Son of Man. This is the conclusion to which Goetz is inclined.

The late Dr. Rashdall rejected the belief that our Lord gave any direction to perpetuate the Eucharist. His conclusion was as follows:

¹ *Bibl. Theology*, i, 140-1. (E.T.)

² Spitta.

"The words 'This do in remembrance of me,' are found only in St. Paul's account (and in the longer text of Luke) and may certainly be regarded as a later addition. If we set these words aside, there is nothing to suggest that our Lord had the intention of founding an institution or permanent rite of any kind. Whatever exactly happened at the last supper, the idea of perpetually commemorating that supper or of investing with a new significance the Jewish offering of cup and bread at the table was the work of the Church and not of its founder."³

Dr. Barnes, Bishop of Birmingham, writes: "Undoubtedly when he wrote, some twenty-five years after the crucifixion, the Eucharist was a fixed rite of the Christian community, and St. Paul believed that Jesus had said at the last supper, 'This do in remembrance of me.'"⁴

Dr. Brilioth asserts that "to take for granted even that the Eucharist rests upon the direct command of Jesus is, in fact, to evade one of the hardest problems with which modern study has to deal."⁵

Another writer observes "that Jesus then said 'Do this' is an assumption which our evidence does not support."⁶

There has been much renewed inquiry into the evidences for the belief that our Lord actually said those directive words—"Do this in remembrance of me."

I.

The Gospel of St. Mark, which is usually regarded as the earliest of the Evangelists, does not contain any such direction. If our Lord himself did actually order the continuance of the Eucharist the omission of that direction by St. Mark is strange.

³ Rashdall, *The Idea of Atonement*, 1919, p. 58.

⁴ "Should such a Faith offend?" p. 211.

⁵ *Eucharistic Faith and Practice*. (S.P.C.K.), p. 2.

⁶ In *Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation*, Ed. Rawlinson. 1928. p. 121.

We should certainly not have expected the earliest of the evangelists to omit all reference to those most important words: "Do this in remembrance of me." The omission is considered by a number of recent critics as rendering it doubtful whether those words were ever spoken by Christ.

On the other hand, the proposition that what an evangelist did not repeat he did not know, is an assumption impossible to generalise, requiring a knowledge of a writer's mentality and circumstances very difficult for a critic to possess, and liable to be unconsciously influenced, in any particular application, by the critic's own suppositions. The argument from silence is notoriously precarious. Many English critics have been trained in cautious awareness of its dangers, and the extraordinary difficulty of escaping subjective influences. St. Mark was writing for his own age, not for ours. Presumably he never dreamed of the place which his narrative would hold in the Christian centuries, nor of the conditions which his far off readers would require. The evangelist did not compose under the control of exacting modern canons of historical compilation. His tendency was to record what would be most useful to his own contemporaries. He was writing at a time when the constant reiteration of the Eucharist was the ordinary practice in Christian devotion. He must have known St. Paul's belief about Christ's direction. He may have thought it superfluous to remind his readers of what they already knew, especially if St. Paul's belief was the general belief of the Christian world.

There are recent German critics who acknowledge that St. Mark's omission of Christ's direction is no argument against belief that such direction was actually given. Theodore Haering, for example, says:

"Stress is often laid on the fact that the express command is not given by Mark. But its omission can, purely from the standpoint of historical probability, be explained quite as well from the command being unquestioned . . . The first Christians were sure that they thereby fulfilled the Lord's

will; and . . . it is not so easy to understand how that could be, without some expression of his will.”⁷

II.

St. Matthew’s Gospel, like that of St. Mark, omits the words “Do this in remembrance of me.”

Kaftan maintains that the omission in St. Matthew and St. Mark of the direction to repeat the institution must be balanced by the fact that the disciples had observed the rite from the very earliest beginnings. Attempts to account for this practice of the disciples without postulating any direction from Christ are forced.⁸

Wand maintains that the words of the direction: “Do this:” are not in themselves of fundamental importance. “Since men for whom obedience to the Lord’s commands had become the very breath of life repeated this service unanimously and without apparent question, we may be very sure that such continuance was in line with his known wishes.”⁹

III.

The evidence of St. Luke is greatly complicated by the variety of texts.

The reading in the revised text is:

“And when the hour was come, he sat down, and the apostles with him. And he said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer: for I say unto you, I will not eat it, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God. And he received a cup, and when he had given thanks, he said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves: for I say unto you, I will not drink from henceforth of the fruit of

⁷ Theodore Haering, *The Christian Faith*, 1913. ii, 767.

⁸ Julius Kaftan, *Dogmatik*. 1897. p. 610.

⁹ *The Development of Sacramentalism*. p. 103.

the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come. And he took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave to them, saying, This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. And the cup in like manner after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood, even that which is poured out for you."¹⁰

The text of the institution in St. Luke xxii, 17, as given in the English Revised Version is that found in all the great manuscripts except the Cambridge Codex D. and a few lesser MSS., and in all the versions except the Syriac.

The shorter text contained in the Cambridge Codex D is as follows:

(17) "And having received a cup he gave thanks and said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves:

(18) For I say unto you; Henceforth I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God come.

(19) And having taken bread, he gave thanks, broke it and gave it to them, saying, This is my body."

The similarities and the differences between the Longer and the Shorter Text are obvious. Both place the reception of the wine before the reception of the bread. But the Longer Text contains two receptions of wine, one before the reception of the bread, and one after: whereas the Shorter Text mentions only one cup. The Longer Text also contains the words directing the perpetuation of the sacrament: "This do in remembrance of me:" whereas the Shorter Text omits these words. The Syriac Versions differ both from the longer and the shorter texts by placing the reception of the bread before the reception of the wine. But the Syriac Versions all contain the words: "This do in remembrance of me."

There is a further difference between the Lucan narrative and the other two Synoptic accounts. Both in St. Mark's and in St. Matthew's account our Lord's saying about drinking no

¹⁰ S. Luke, xxii, 14-20.

more of the wine is placed *after* the institution of the Eucharist, whereas in St. Luke this saying is placed *before* it.

Which of the two represents the original text of St. Luke? Is it the Longer or the Shorter rendering? The principal difficulty in the Longer Text consists of course in its reference to two cups. Westcott and Hort threw the weight of their great authority on the side of the Shorter Text. They held that if the Longer Text was the original, the only motive which could account for the omission in the Shorter Text must have been the difficulty caused by the double reference to the cup. "But this explanation involves the extreme improbability that the most familiar form of the words of institution, agreeing with St. Paul's record, should be selected for omission; while the vaguer, less sacred, and less familiar words, in great part peculiar to St. Luke, was retained." It was acknowledged that both readings are difficult. It is not explained why the Shorter Text inverted the order of the bread and of the cup. But this was thought to be illustrated by St. Luke's inversion of the order of our Lord's temptations. The usual explanation, that the first cup mentioned by St. Luke, according to the Longer Text, was a reference to the Passover, was not accepted by Westcott and Hort. The Shorter Text was regarded as the original.

Dr. Sanday in his invaluable article in Hastings' Dictionary, 1899, re-issued in a separate volume as *Outlines of the Life of Christ*, supported the Shorter Text of St. Luke. He fully recognised that the greatest loss which that Shorter Text involved was the command to repeat the rite in memory of its founder. He also pointed out that the introduction of this command into the text must have taken place exceedingly early, as is proved by the wide circulation it secured. But he thought that the Longer Text was an interpolation, and argued that the temptation to expand is much stronger than to contract. His treatment of the subject was as usual marked by impressive caution, and he cannot be said to have come down with conclusive weight on either side.

In this advocacy of the Shorter Text Westcott and Hort were supported by Percy Gardner, by Johannes Weiss, Titius and others.

Adolf Hoffmann published in 1896 a careful critical estimate of Westcott and Hort's preference for the Shorter Text.¹¹ Hoffmann was convinced that the first cup mentioned in the Longer Text (St. Luke xxii, 17) cannot be the same cup as that mentioned in verse 20 and of which our Lord said "This cup is the new covenant in my blood." Hoffmann quotes in support of this Westcott and Hort's own remark, that the first cup is mentioned in vaguer, less sacred, and less familiar words. None of the defenders of the Shorter Text have been able, in his opinion, to solve the difficulties which that rendering involves. The Shorter Text omits the words, "This cup is the new covenant in my blood, even that which is poured out for you:" words which are of the deepest importance as interpreting the value of the chalice, and which also are contained in the earlier narrative of St. Mark. Hoffmann's conclusion is that the Shorter Text is not the original of St. Luke. The relation of this Shorter Text to the rest of the New Testament evidence is a problem of the greatest difficulty.

In the *Journal of Theological Studies* in 1903,¹² Dr. Blakiston pointed out that even if the Shorter Text were accepted in preference to the Longer "we are still left with the inexplicable variation in the order of the bread and the cup, which discredits either St. Luke's version or that of St. Paul and of the Synoptists." Nor was it clear that the Shorter Text is preferred on the ground that the temptation is usually rather to expand than to contract a narrative; for the expansion in this case only introduces fresh confusion. Blakiston accordingly suggested that the Longer Text in St. Luke is a deliberate though intentionally incomplete, conflation of two distinct, independent and perhaps equally original narratives of the institution. He held that the last supper was an anticipated

¹¹ See reference in Hoffmann, p. 10.

¹² *J.T.S.*, Vol. IV, 1903, pp. 548-555.

Passover, and that the Lord's Supper is a denaturalised perpetuation of the Paschal sacrament.

In the same volume of the *Journal of Theological Studies* it was observed by another writer, J. C. Lambert, that "In Germany, it is the marked tendency of recent critical opinion, especially in the case of those who have made a special study of the Lord's Supper, to go back to the reading of the *Textus Receptus* as the correct one after all. Jülicher regards the decision of Westcott and Hort as a mistake, while Schmiedel describes the variant reading of the Western text as an abnormality of no significance. And Lutheran, Neo-Lutheran, Roman Catholic and advanced critical scholars in the majority of cases now range themselves on the same side."¹³

The ordinary text is supported by the overwhelming mass of evidence in the MSS. Moreover, the ordinary text is by far the most difficult. It is immeasurably easier to account for the other texts as endeavours to remove the difficulties presented by the ordinary text than to show how the ordinary text arose out of either of the simpler, less complicated versions. What the Shorter Text does is in one case to get rid of the double mention of the cup, and in the other to rearrange the order by making the mention of the bread precede the mention of the cup.

Dalman¹⁴ accepts the text of St. Luke, which includes the direction, "Do this in remembrance of me." Yet elsewhere he says that it is possible that originally it was only St. Paul who recorded that Christ instituted the breaking of bread in remembrance of him. But he adds that "the purpose of the apostle, however, was not to bring the usage itself into remembrance, this having been already established as the meal of the Lord (I Cor. xi, 20), and celebrated everywhere in the churches (*c.f.* Acts ii, 42); but the significance of the institution not having always been kept in mind, he considered it necessary to enjoin

¹³ J. C. Lambert in *J.T.S.*, iv, 187. (1903).

¹⁴ *Jesus*, p. 176.

it. The evangelists could well leave out the Lord's ordinance, as their intention was not to describe the origin of the Eucharist but the occurrences of the last night in the Master's life on earth."

Feine¹⁵ accepts the Longer Text of St. Luke as it stands in the Revised Text against the Shorter Text. He urges that the origin of the Shorter Text out of the Longer Text is much more simply intelligible than the reverse.

In the *Journal of Theological Studies* (July, 1927) Dr. Bate noted that Bishop Gore, who had formerly regarded the Longer Text as the original, had in his volume entitled *Can We Then Believe?* recorded his abandonment of a preference for that text. He admitted the force of the textual argument against it as presented by Dr. Hort and Dr. Sanday. But Bishop Gore still found the problem insoluble. Bishop Gore felt that it is "difficult to suppose that St. Luke should have been content to give an account of the institution which ends so abruptly, and leave it to be supposed that our Lord dealt with the cup before the bread, and should have omitted in connection with the cup any reference to its sacramental meaning."

Dr. Bate agreed that the bishop was "justified alike in abandoning the Longer Text, and in feeling that the Shorter Text, as commonly presented, is extremely hard to accept and to understand." Dr. Bate, therefore, proposed to reconstruct a Shorter Text on the basis of the textual evidence, a text which seemed to him likely to be what St. Luke actually wrote, and also to offer none of the difficulties which are involved in accepting the Shorter reading found in the Cambridge *Codex Bezae*. The text suggested is as follows:

"And he said unto them, with desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer: for I say unto you I will not eat of it until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God. And he received a cup, and gave thanks and said, Take and divide it

¹⁵ *Jesus Christus und Paulus*. 1902. p. 213.

among yourselves. For I say unto you, I will not drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come. But behold the hand of him that betrayeth me," etc. This allusive text is explained on the theory that St. Luke's narrative was published under circumstances which made it inadvisable to disclose the inner meaning of Christian worship.

Lagrange thinks that the difficulty is principally caused by regarding the cup first mentioned as Eucharistic, whereas in reality it belonged to the Passover. The different Shorter Texts are due to the first cup being regarded as Eucharistic and are endeavours to remove the supposed double reference to the Eucharistic chalice (*cf.* Lagrange, p. 546). Finding two cups mentioned the purpose of the Shorter Texts was to leave one out.

It is certainly significant that the first mention of the cup in verse 17 reports that our Lord "took the cup and gave thanks, and said 'Take this and divide it among yourselves,'" but entirely omits the explanation given in the second mention in verse 20. ("This cup is the new covenant in my blood"). Does not this difference imply a distinction between the nature of the cup in the first case, and that in the second? What if the cup which is mentioned first belongs to the Passover, and not to the Eucharist? If that explanation is admitted the main difficulty of the mention of two cups is removed. It is, of course, true that the whole difficulty is not thereby removed, for our Lord's words about drinking no more of the fruit of the vine, which St. Luke places in connection with the Passover cup, are in St. Mark placed after the Eucharistic cup.

Hoffmann holds that there is no evidence in the early fathers of the church to support the Shorter Text. Justin Martyr, in his first *Apology*, chapter 66, speaking of the Eucharist, expressly says that "the apostles, in the memoirs composed by them, which are called gospels, have thus delivered unto us what was enjoined upon them; that Jesus took bread, and when he had given thanks, said, This do ye in remembrance of me,

this is my body; and that after the same manner, having taken the cup and given thanks, he said, This is my blood." Thus Justin Martyr quotes the direction to perpetuate the Eucharist as contained in the gospels. And St. Luke is the only gospel in which these words are contained.

Justin Martyr¹⁶ says that the gospel reports that Jesus took bread, adding the words, Do this in remembrance of me. Now it should be noted that no other gospel than St. Luke contains this direction. And also that St. Luke connects this direction only with the bread, as Justin Martyr does, whereas St. Paul connects it with both the Eucharistic elements. It would therefore seem clear that Justin Martyr's text of the third gospel contained our Lord's direction to perpetuate the institution.

There is also reason to think that the gospel of St. Luke as Marcion possessed it contained a reading found in the Longer Text. For Tertullian, in his reply to Marcion, devotes one entire book (Book IV) to a comparison between Marcion's own doctrines and the gospel which Marcion accepted.¹⁷ That gospel was the gospel of St. Luke. Tertullian argued that Marcion's theory that our Lord had no substantial human body at all, but only a phantom body, was refuted by our Lord's utterances at the institution of the Eucharist, since Christ "when mentioning the cup, and making the new covenant to be sealed in his blood, affirms the reality of his body." Now these words of our Lord are contained in the Longer Text of St. Luke, but not in the Shorter Text.¹⁸

The defence of the ordinary text of St. Luke may be summarised in the following lines: that none of the great MSS. contains the shorter form with the solitary exception of *Codex Bezae*; that Marcion and Justin Martyr both know the longer version; that the Shorter Text itself is inadmissible because St.

¹⁶ *Apol.*, i, 66.

¹⁷ *Adv. Marc.*, iv, 40.

¹⁸ cf. Goetz. 1907. p. 119.

Luke knew the teaching of St. Paul and highly valued it, and it is not credible that the evangelist would have departed from it to the extent that the shorter reading does. On these grounds it is reasonable to conclude that the shorter form can not be the original.

IV.

We now approach the evidence of St. Paul, bearing in mind, of course, that his is the earliest evidence we possess.

In discussing St. Paul's statements about the Eucharist the first question is, From what source did he conceive himself to have derived his information? When he recorded the list of our Lord's appearances after the resurrection he wrote: "I delivered unto you that which I also received" (I Cor. xv, 3). When he recorded the account of the institution of the Eucharist he wrote: "I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you" (I Cor. xi, 23). In the former case St. Paul does not say from whom the information was received. In the latter he says expressly that he had received it of the Lord. What is the exact meaning of this expression? Did St. Paul claim to have received the information supernaturally? St. Chrysostom and many ancient writers believed that St. Paul claimed to have received a supernatural revelation direct from the glorified Christ about the Eucharist. Modern opinion is divided.

Some writers think that an immediate communication from the ascended Lord is implied in the phrase itself. (*ἀπὸ* not *παρὰ*). But whether the preposition need imply this seems quite uncertain. However, that St. Paul believed that the source from which he derived the information was supernatural is sometimes thought to be supported by what he says about his gospel in the Galatian letter: "Neither did I receive it from men, nor was I taught it, but it came to me through revelation of Jesus Christ" (Galatians i, 12). But what St. Paul here told the Galatians need not mean a claim to have derived a knowledge of historical facts through supernatural revelation. He

may mean only that he was divinely enlightened as to the spiritual significance which he placed upon the facts. It is very questionable whether a supernatural revelation of historical occurrences is a Jewish conception. St. Paul's knowledge of the facts which took place on the night of the betrayal in the upper chamber in Jerusalem is more naturally accounted for in a purely natural way. Bernard Weiss,¹⁹ for instance, considers that St. Paul's knowledge that Christ on the night when he was betrayed instituted the Eucharist (I Cor. xi, 23-25) only shows that the Apostle found the custom of breaking bread and consecrating the cup already existing in the church, and inquired into its origin. St. Paul "only mentions the story in order that he may attach to it doctrines regarding the significance . . . and these doctrines he himself traces back to a higher origin (verse 23)." "He has the history of the institution . . . directly or indirectly out of the tradition of the original apostles."²⁰

"The history of the institution of the supper was naturally well known to him and to his readers from the observance of the rite in the congregation. But Paul, who had not been present at the institution, had received from the Lord and through his spirit a special revelation concerning its purpose and significance."²¹

"Although, as evangelical tradition shows, the apostles did not need any special injunction for the repetition of this act, because its very nature demanded this, Paul received the special revelation that this breaking of the bread, together with the thanksgiving and the statement of Jesus concerning its significance, is to be constantly repeated as a remembrance of him."²²

The natural explanation is that St. Paul derived his knowledge of the institution of the Eucharist from the church at

¹⁹ B. Weiss, *Bibl. Theol.*, i, 404.

²⁰ *ib.* p. 468.

²¹ B. Weiss, *Commentary*. (E.T.), p. 228.

²² *ib.* p. 229.

the time of his conversion, and found the rite already prevalent.

Suppose, however, that St. Paul actually believed himself to have received the facts about the institution by a direct supernatural revelation. Would that mean that the original apostles knew nothing about such a direction? Did they derive their belief about the perpetuation of the Eucharist from one who was not there, and was not even a convert until afterwards?

The account of the institution of the Eucharist St. Paul had already given to the Corinthians when he founded the church in that city between three and four years before writing his epistle: that is to say, in A.D. 54. "That which also I delivered unto you." It is memorable that his record of the institution in the first Epistle to the Corinthians was simply due to local irregularities. If it had not been for the disorders at Corinth St. Paul's account of the institution would probably never have been written. There is not the smallest suggestion that the apostle is imposing a rite, but only that he is correcting irregularities about its observance. Eucharistic doctrine and practice was taught at Corinth some twenty years after our Lord's ascension.

It must be remembered that St. Paul's account of the institution of the eucharist was written to a church which included messengers from the Church at Jerusalem, and persons hostile to himself. If his Eucharistic teaching could have been opposed by the hostile element in the Corinthian Church they would not have hesitated to do it. It is not credible that he would have asserted as positive fact what was liable to be refuted by the very men to whom he was writing.

Reville, who thinks that St. Paul here claims to be the recipient of a supernatural revelation, insists at the same time that the facts which it interprets must have already existed. St. Paul's mind concentrates on the facts. They acquired a special value in his eyes. The revelation itself is inexplicable without them. St. Paul cannot have invented in a vision the

concrete facts that Jesus on the night in which he was betrayed took bread and pronounced a eucharistic prayer. That is not the substance of his vision, but the substance on which the vision itself is founded. It is, says Reville,²³ absolutely incredible that St. Paul should assert as a positive fact acquired by revelation in a church where he was confronted with representatives from the apostles of Jerusalem. These representatives would not have failed to inflict upon him a disastrous refutation if his asserted facts did not correspond with the reality in which they themselves were personally involved. But there is not the slightest trace of any conflict between St. Paul and his opponents at Corinth concerning the eucharistic facts. What they had not realised was the interpretation which St. Paul placed upon these facts.

Dr. N. P. Williams²⁴ urges that "It is reasonable to suggest that St. Paul's authority is *prima facie* good enough." That which I also received means received from the mother Church of Jerusalem.

It is extremely rare to find in the writings of St. Paul a quotation of the actual words of Christ. This rareness gives a peculiar weight to the occasion when he actually professes to be quoting them. It is natural to think that Christ's words at the institution were to St. Paul unusually impressive.

In estimating the value of St. Paul's declaration that the repetition of the Eucharist rests on our Lord's distinct direction, it should be remembered that elsewhere he is most careful to draw a clear distinction between directions which rest on apostolic authority, and those which rest on the express authority of our Lord. Thus when discussing marriage problems St. Paul says that on certain matters he "has no commandment of the Lord."²⁵ He insists on the difference between that which rests on human authority and that which rests on the authority

²³ Reville, *Les Origines de L'Eucharistic*. 1908. p. 93-94.

²⁴ In *Essays Catholic and Critical*, p. 400.

²⁵ I Cor., vii, 25.

of Christ. With regard to the former, he says: "I give my judgment as one that hath obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful."²⁶ He reiterates the same distinction. "I give charge, yet not I but the Lord." "But to the rest say I, not the Lord."²⁷ Would a man who lays such stress on the distinction between the two authorities be likely to assert that the perpetuation rests on Christ's command unless he had the strongest reasons for that assertion?

VI.

Critical discussions of this kind must often remind us that much depends on presuppositions. There are presuppositions which hinder or prevent belief that our Lord did actually direct the perpetual observance of the Eucharist. This subject is admirably treated by Dr. N. P. Williams in his paper in *Essays Catholic and Critical*.²⁸ His remarks deserve to be read and read again.

It is evident that our Lord's intention with regard to the bread and wine must depend on the nature of the act in which he was engaged. Of course, if the last meal in the Jerusalem Chamber was nothing more than a pathetic farewell, there would be no reason to suppose that our Lord had the remotest intention that it should be repeated. The very nature of the act would preclude its repetition. Again, if the death of Christ was not a redemptive offering of reparation to the Father, if the atonement itself is nothing but a theory mistakenly imposed upon the facts at a later date, then also there would be no reason to think that Christ intended its repetition. The intention of our Lord about that religious act on the night of his betrayal will depend on the whole character of Christianity as a religion of redemption.

Thus our opinion of the probability or certainty that our

²⁶ I Cor., vii, 25.

²⁷ I Cor., vii, 10 ; I Cor., vii, 12.

²⁸ p. 420-1.

Lord did or did not ordain the perpetuation of the Eucharist is largely influenced by our presuppositions. When, for instance, it is urged that the meaning of our Lord's action with the bread and wine in the upper room must have been something which would be intelligible to the disciples at the time, on the ground that he could not have intended to mystify them, it must be remembered that they were constantly all through his ministry unable to comprehend the real significance of his words. It is not credible that the disciples were competent to appreciate the meaning of his death and passion before it happened, nor the meaning of the devotional rite which he associated with reference to his body and his blood. It is an exceedingly precarious thing to limit the intention of Christ at the Institution by the capacity of his hearers at the time. It is far more reasonable to apply to their experience on that occasion the words: "These things understood not his disciples at the first but afterwards." And therefore it is uncritical to rule out all later developments of sacramental principles as if they were certainly not in the Master's mind because they were not in the minds of his hearers on that ever memorable night.

The fact is that our realisation of the intention of Christ in that devotional rite will depend upon our conception as to who he is. Our critical conclusions will be very greatly determined by our doctrinal presuppositions. If he is human and nothing else than human, the critic easily assumes that he cannot have gone beyond contemporary Jewish ideas. And the whole nature of the breaking of the bread will be restricted to those limits, and Christ's intentions limited as well. If, on the other hand, he is what the matured reflection of St. Paul and the fourth evangelist declare, then nothing will be more natural than to credit him with a farsightedness beyond that little reverential group of Galileans, and an intention that the rite in which he was engaged should become perpetual, and that he should have made his intention at the time quite plain.

It will always be the case that those who neither believe in the divine personality of our Lord, nor in the atonement as a sacrificial act, will conclude that Christ did not enjoin the

perpetuation of the Eucharist, and that such an idea formed no part of his intention. Conversely it will also be the case that those who believe in him as incarnate deity and redeemer of mankind, will conclude that the continuance of the Eucharist was his intention and also his express command. Everything, therefore, depends on which of these interpretations of Christ's person and work is the true.

If the perpetuation of the Eucharist is believed to depend on the authority of the church and not on that of Christ, undoubtedly further questions will arise. Many will feel that the rite is thereby placed in an entirely different position from that which it has held down the centuries. If the Eucharist does not rest on the authority of Christ, the problem still remains, whether this was nevertheless his intention. If the church is responsible for the perpetuation of this rite, then of course the practice will depend either on individual estimates of its value, or else upon regard for the authority of the church. It will be a singularly unexpected result if the advance of criticism should lead to greater esteem for the church and its authority. Of course criticism may have the opposite effect. Men may come to attach far less importance to this rite if they believe it was never authorised by Christ himself, and only depends on the influence of the church. On the other hand, if they believe that the words elsewhere attributed to Christ, "When he the Spirit of truth is come he will guide you into all the truth," represent Christ's mind, they will be prepared to acknowledge that the universal consent of Christendom for centuries to the supremacy of the Eucharist is an indication of Christ's will, and has proceeded under the Spirit of Christ's direction. In that case the difference between the traditional belief and the critical negative will be very much diminished, and if Christ did not himself utter his intention in so many words, he has uttered it through his body which is the church. But this estimate of the church's authority gives it a very high exalted value to the conscience of a Christian.

W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON.

ART. III.—LOLLARDY.

It is usual to speak of John Wyclif as The Morning Star of the Reformation,¹ but it is well to ask—With what limitations has he a right to that title? To answer that question we must review the history of Lollardy and try to determine its position and prevalence in the early years of the sixteenth century.

Wyclif was a Yorkshireman, honest, hard-headed and combative by nature, before Oxford had made him a subtle controversialist. He had succeeded Fitz-Ralph, Archbishop of Armagh, as head of the Secular Priests opposed to Franciscan dominance in the University.² His academic speculations were on the borderland of Church and State and concerned with the relations of the Spiritual and Temporal powers. He was in consequence drawn into public life, became a royal chaplain, championed the cause of the king against the Pope, and was a diplomatist at Bruges. Finding his country ruined by taxation due to the war, and her credit destroyed by repudiated loans, he saw but one remedy—the plundering of a church which was over-rich. This was not only in accordance with his academic speculations, but appealed to him on practical and moral grounds. Being a man of simple tastes, he hated the luxury of the clergy, and was full of moral indignation at the abuses which were only too patent. Then controversy led him to consider the popular beliefs which supported the existing system, and his hard common sense rendered him intolerant of all superstitions, however innocent and childlike. He went back to the Gospel and identified the church of his day with Judaism in the time of our Lord. He was called “The Evangelic Doctor”: and believed that religion could only revive

¹ Bale: *Cent.* iv, 154 was apparently the first who gave Wyclif this title.

² *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, edited by Shirley: R.S., p. liii.

when the church was poor. In these contentions he had the support of great men with greedy eyes on church estates and of needy scholars at the University disappointed about preferment. The best brains at Oxford—Repyngdon, Aston, Hereford, and Purvey—were also at his service. The Chancellor and Proctors protected him as far as they dared, and there was a time when Friar Stokes, his opponent, went in fear of his life.³

It is impossible to construct a coherent system of theology out of his writings. Like all controversialists he was driven to attack or defend positions which he would not himself have chosen. Besides, while the Latin works are indubitably his, it is very uncertain how far he was responsible for the English works which go by his name. Yet the English works are more important if we would understand the Lollardy of the fifteenth century.

In the Latin works, Wyclif is a cautious Augustinian,⁴ much influenced by Archbishop Bradwardine,⁵ whose *De causa Dei contra Pelagium* remained the standard work on Grace until well on in the seventeenth century. In the English works we read:—

“Each man that shall be damned is damned for his own guilt, and each man that shall be saved is saved by his own merit.”⁶

What would Luther or Calvin have said to that?⁷ Yet it sug-

³ *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, 299 ff.

⁴ Rashdall, *Wyclif*, D.N.B.

⁵ Bradwardine, 1290-1335. So in Chaucer's *Nun's Priest's Tale* we read

But I ne cannot boult it to the been
As can the holy Doctour Saint Austin,
Or Boece or the Bishop Bradwardine.

As late as 1618 Sir Henry Savile edited the *De Causa Dei*.

⁶ Sermon: *The Gospel on the Chairing of Saint Petre* in Winns' *Selections*, p. 95.

⁷ Parson's *Examen of Foxe's Calendar of Saints*, p. 186. He is delighted to quote Luther and Melancthon's disparaging remarks about Wyclif.

gests the standpoint of the fifteenth century Lollards who were frankly Pelagians. A generation after Wyclif many of them had denied Original Sin, repudiated the Sacraments of Baptism, Holy Communion, Penance and Matrimony, and the keeping of Sunday and holy days.⁸

This development of his teaching would no doubt have staggered Wyclif, and it is very doubtful if he would have approved of some practical applications of his doctrine of Grace. It is true that the Lollards of the fifteenth century were unable to read *De Dominio Divino* or *De Dominio Civili*, and would not have understood them had they been available. But all through the centuries men have been influenced by great books which they have not read, and ideas are never so potent or so dangerous as when they have been translated into the ordinary speech and summed up in popular slogans. Dominion for Wyclif implied a Lord and Subjects. God, he argued, was Lord of all things, and men held what they had, of things temporal or spiritual, directly and immediately from him. There were no mesne lords. Such a theory ultimately led to a denial of a mediatorial church and a mediating priesthood. In feudal language he was anticipating what Luther meant when he spoke of justification by Faith alone. Wyclif goes on:—

“All lordship of man, natural or civil, is conferred upon him by God, as the prime author, in consideration of his returning continually to God the service due unto him: but by the fact that a man by omission or commission becomes guilty of mortal sin, he defrauds his Lord-in-Chief of the said service, and by consequence ensures forfeiture: wherefore . . . he is rightfully deprived of all lordship whatsoever.”⁹

This argument was used to invalidate the sacraments celebrated by priests in mortal sin, and to justify the confiscation

⁸ Walsingham, *Chronicle*, R.S., 252-250. Quoted by Gairdner, *Lollardy and the Reformation*, i, 48.

⁹ Quoted Lane Poole, *Illustrations of the History of Mediaeval Thought*, 294.

of the property of a negligent church, but it was soon seen to be equally cogent when applied to laymen—their rights and possessions. Again, following St. Augustine on the negative character of evil, he says: "Sin is nothing, and men, when they sin, become nothing. Therefore they can possess nothing." On the other hand, "the faithful man hath the whole world of riches, because for him all things work together for good." Each faithful man therefore is lord of the universe, and it follows that all goods must necessarily be held in common. So he interprets, "Charity (i.e. Grace) seeketh not her own—seeketh not to be a proprietor."¹⁰

Wyclif was perfectly aware that his theories could not be reconciled with the life about him. So he argued that all governments were the result of the Fall and due to the usurpation of Satan. He concluded with the daring paradox that in this world God ought to obey the Devil, by which he apparently meant that it was God's will for men to accommodate themselves to the world order until the divine order could be established and Dominion founded on Grace.

However revolutionary his ideas might be, Wyclif meant to restrict their application to the church, and not to extend them to the state; and however convinced he was of his theories, he was not like St. Francis, ready to strip himself of his advantages and wed Poverty as a bride. He saw the evils of pluralities and non-residence: but he was himself a pluralist and for most of his life an absentee.¹¹ He denounced papal provisions, but he accepted one from Gregory XI, and was very angry when Urban VI refused to confirm the grant.¹² Moreover, he went bail for a large amount, so that a friend might go to Avignon in search of an additional benefice.¹³ He maintained that no priest should be entangled in affairs of state, but

¹⁰ Lane Poole, *Illustrations of the History of Mediaeval Thought*, 292-296.

¹¹ Jenkins, *C.Q.R.*, cvi, 64ff,

¹² *Ibid.*, 67-69.

¹³ Workman, *John Wyclif*, i, 243.

he was long engaged in politics and it was the Bad Parliament and not the Good which had his support. He worked very well with the Friars so long as he was attached to John of Gaunt, and only discovered their manifold iniquities when that alliance was at an end.¹⁴ He wished the churches to be poor, plain and without adornments, but he retained his rich benefice, ministered in his "painted" church, and died in possession of all his emoluments. Though his life was to this extent a contradiction of his creed, he no more perceived it than wealthy communists perceive a like inconsistency to-day. He longed for change, he worked for change, he was willing to use his position to promote change, but until change should come, he felt justified in adapting himself to the conditions of life about him.

How was the change, which he desired, to be brought about? Only by making the will of God better known, and the will of God, he thought, was plainly revealed in Holy Scripture. But how was a people, mostly illiterate, to learn the scriptures? Only by preachers sent out expressly to expound its literal sense. An English Bible and the poor preachers were to convert the world power into the Kingdom of God.

It is indeed strange that Wyclif, "The Great Clerk," the learned theologian, the Master of Distinctions, should show such contempt for the *mixtim theologi*¹⁵ (motley theologians) and their learned commentaries. How came he to believe so wholeheartedly that the Bible was its own interpreter, and alone necessary for salvation?¹⁶ Perhaps after all his triumphs in disputation and his successful defence of strange paradoxes, he had come to doubt the value of learning and the validity of his exquisite conclusions—that is the Nemesis which lies in wait for controversialists.¹⁷ But perhaps it is more true to say that

¹⁴ Workman, *John Wyclif*, i, 283 ; ii, 43, 44.

¹⁵ Lechler, *John Wickliffe*, 240.

¹⁶ *Ibid.* for Wyclif's views on Scriptural interpretation, 243-245.

¹⁷ *Ibid.* 224 quotes from *De Veritate Sacra Scripturae* :

"I acknowledge that oft times for the sake of vain glory, I

Wyclif was not primarily interested in dogmatics, was less interested in ascetic or devotional theology, and had a complete contempt for the allegorical interpretation of scripture then so prevalent. Poetry, mysticism and other-worldliness were alien to him. He was fundamentally, in spite of his learning, the plain man, and he wished to be a social reformer. He thought that he found in the Bible a vivid condemnation of the world of his day. He found in it also plain directions for life, and devoutly believed that conduct was nine-tenths of religion. Wyclif at heart was a pragmatist Englishman.

Reading the Bible in this spirit he became convinced that the New Testament was "open to the understanding of simple men in the points that be most needful to salvation," and that "no man was so rude a scholar, but that he might learn from the words of the Gospel according to his simplicity."¹⁸ It was only necessary that he should have it in the tongue wherein he was born. That was his right, for:

"The Holy Ghost gave to apostles wit on Whit Sunday for to know all manner of languages, to teach their people God's law thereby; and God would that the people were taught God's law in divers tongues."¹⁹

That Wyclif and his friends, Nicholas Hereford and John Purvey, should translate the Scriptures was, from the ecclesiastical standpoint, quite unobjectionable. Wyclif knew that the French had a version in the vernacular,²⁰ and Purvey tells of a Flemish version that had been ultimately approved by the Pope.²¹ Wyclif's version was made from the Vulgate, and even

¹⁸ Workman, II, 151.

¹⁹ *De Officio Pastoralis*, ch. xv; Winn's *Selections*, p. 19.

²⁰ *De Officio* quoted Trevelyan, *Age of Wyclif*, 130.

²¹ Purvey's *Prologue*; Winn's *Selections*, 21.

departed from the teaching of Scripture, both in what I maintained and what I opposed, when my double aim was to acquire a dazzling fame among the people and to lay bare the pride of the Sophists."

Netter of Walden did not impugn its accuracy, while there was nothing of heretical pravity in Purvey's Prologue.²² Why then was it banned? Because so many did not read it for their soul's edification, but in order to find texts and instances whereby they might condemn the church and the social order. In the Bible they found an arsenal of maledictions against priests, lawyers, judges and kings. It is not in consequence surprising that the bishops were driven to forbid the book to all who were not licensed to read it by a competent spiritual authority.

With the Bible, or parts of it, and with tracts from the prolific pen of Wyclif, the poor preachers went forth not so much to proclaim a Gospel as to prepare for a Reformation. There was no lack of preaching at the time, and no lack of scripture in the sermons, but they were not calculated to upset the world.²³ Apart from friars, preachers needed a license from the bishop, but Wyclif maintained that Christ was sufficient authority, and that the license might come immediately from him.²⁴ This was undeniable, but it hardly justified Wyclif in assuming Christ's power and licensing men himself. He was not however the first or last heretic who has identified himself with God.

His action has been compared with that of St. Francis,²⁵ but St. Francis was as humble as Wyclif was proud. St. Francis sent forth his little brothers to teach the poor that God loved them; Wyclif sent forth the poor preachers to tell the poor how evil the rich priests were. He supplied them with a variety of forcible expressions. He writes of "stinking friars"; he calls the bishops "horned fiends," the Pope "a sinful idiot," and the cardinals "incarnate devils"; he describes the monks as "gluttonous idolaters committing whoredom with the devil," and the parish priests as "idolatrous leprous and simoniacal

²² *C.Q.R.*, Jan., 1901.

²³ Owst, *Preaching in Mediaeval England*.

²⁴ *Sermon on Dai of von Evangelist*; Winn's *Selections*, 31-34.

²⁵ Workman, vol. ii, 201, 214.

heretics."²⁶ In the schools he was a subtle disputant, in the market place a pungent pamphleteer: but it is only fair to add that his opponents paid him back in his own coin.

Such preaching pained the pious soul of Walter Hilton in his retirement at Thurgarton. He writes:

"The words that they show by preaching, sound all to backbiting and to striving and to discord, making reproving of states and persons; and yet say they that all this is charity and zeal for righteousness. But it is not sooth, for St. James the Apostle saith that *where'er envy is and flitting, there is unstableness and all evil work*. And therefore that cunning (knowledge) that bringeth forth such sins cometh not from the Father of Lights that is God, but is earthly, beastly and fiendly."²⁷

The poor preachers might be scurrilous fanatics, but they were undoubtedly sincere and sincerity ensured them success. They had been inspired with a hatred of iniquity and a zeal for social righteousness. The abuses they denounced were real and well known to their hearers, and they may be excused if they exaggerated their prevalence or refused to consider what might be said on the other side. Sometimes they had to skip from one diocese to another in order to escape from episcopal officials, but the bishops, with the exceptions of Courtenay and Despenser, were indifferent—like their successors, they were accustomed to abuse. The poor preachers also at the first had powerful lay support. Knights with their armed retainers protected them on their village greens while they denounced the rector or an adjacent abbey. The motives of these knights were no doubt mixed. Some, like the courtiers of Henry VIII, had greedy eyes on church lands, and were easily persuaded that the church would be more spiritual if disendowed, and the parochial clergy more useful if entirely subservient to themselves. But there were others of whom the pseudo-Knighton,

²⁶ Capes: *English Ch. Hist. XIV and XV Cents.*, 124 culled these flowers of rhetoric from Wyclif's works.

²⁷ Walter Hilton, *Scale of Pefection*, Bk. II, ch. xxvi.

who hated Lollardy, said: "They had a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge."²⁸ These men were thrilled in hearing the scriptures in homely language and received it gladly, rejoicing Wyclif's heart:

"O comfort is of knights that they savoren, much the Gospel of Christ's life. For afterward, if God wole, their lordship shall be taken from priests; and so the staff that maketh them hardy against Christ and his law."²⁹

Wyclif was himself by inheritance, lord of a manor. He came of the smaller gentry, and however socialistic his theories might be, he could not escape from the outlook of his class. Dr. Workman translates from *De Dominio Civili*:

Oh! how happy and fertile would England be if every parish church had as of yore a saintly rector residing with his family, if every manor had a just lord residing with his wife and children; then there would not be so much arable land lying fallow and so great a dearth of cattle.³⁰

Such admirable sentiments might have proceeded from the hero in one of Miss Charlotte Yonge's novels. They are central in the old English tradition, but they were not shared by the poor preachers who were more concerned with the wrongs of villeins and were fascinated by the doctrine of the community of goods.

When the Peasant Revolt was suppressed in 1381, Wyclif, notwithstanding his social antecedents, did not act as Luther did in the Peasant Revolt in Germany. He deprecated the outbreak, but he spoke out with courage on the oppressions suffered by the poor and extenuated as far as possible the crimes committed—even the murder of Archbishop Sudbury. On the other hand he was sensitive to the accusation that the rising was due to what his poor priests had taught.

Some men that ben out of charity slander poor priests with this error, that servants or tenants may lawfully with-

²⁸ Knighton, *Chronicle*, ii, 181.

²⁹ *Sermon on the Gospel of Many Martirs*; Winni's *Selections*, 18.

³⁰ Workman, I, 264.

hold rents and service from their lords when lords be openly wicked in their living.³¹

It is evident then that the accusation had been made before Wyclif's death; and directly after the revolt Courtenay carried an act penalising unlicensed preachers. A generation later Netter of Walden asserted that the Lollards were the prime movers in the rising, and a confession of John Ball, probably spurious, was published to that effect.³² In one sense Netter was right. The ideas of Wyclif had been leavening the masses, though they gave expression to them in terms which he had never intended to be used.³³

The fermentation went on throughout the reign of Richard II, and the social unrest became every year more dangerous. Truthfully or not it was generally attributed to Lollard teaching, and scaremongers blamed the bishops for not putting down the heresy. The bishops, however, could do very little as the Lollards had powerful friends at court, and among them John de Montacute, third Earl of Salisbury,³⁴ that elegant amateur in novelties whom Froissart so admired, and to whom Christine de Pisan sent her son for education.

When Henry IV seized the crown there was a change. Arundel, the restored Archbishop of Canterbury, was prepared to take action, and so there was a petition of Convocation. The House of Commons also took action in a petition not so prolix, but quite as insistent. The result was the passing of the Act *De Hærectico Comburendo* in 1401. It had all the demerits of legislation passed in panic; and Sawtre was burnt before the Bill became law because the authorities were in such a hurry to make an example.

The Act really made little difference. It was too drastic and affected too many people to be put in force. In the

³¹ Winn's *Selections*, 101.

³² *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, 272-274.

³³ Workman, ii, 246.

³⁴ Montacute, *D.N.B.*.

Unlearned Parliament at Coventry of 1404, and in the Parliament at Worcester in 1405 the Lollards were at any rate a strong minority, and in both proposals were made for the confiscation of church property with a view to lessening taxation. In 1406 on the other hand the orthodox retaliated in a long petition setting forth the detestable principles of the Lollards and how easily they might be applied to all forms of private property. In 1410 the Lollards not only proposed the disendowment of the church, but drew up an elaborate scheme for dealing with her possessions. In the same Parliament there was an agitation for stricter laws against heretics. The bishops were accused of negligence; for the Act *De Hæretico Comburendo* had been passed in 1401 and no one had suffered under it. Such was the state of public feeling when Badby the tailor of Evesham was tried and burnt in March, 1410.³⁵

In 1414 was the dangerous conspiracy of that unbending Lollard, Sir John Oldcastle, Lord Cobham. He was a popular man of great wealth, and a soldier of unbounded audacity. Henry V, who had been his friend, had attempted to convert him in August, 1413, without success. He was arrested the following month and defied the ecclesiastical court. When convicted of heresy, the king intervened that he might have fifty days' respite, and it was perhaps by the king's connivance that he escaped from the Tower. If so, he was ungrateful, for he at once began to organize an insurrection. Small bands of Lollards were soon moving through the country towards London. It was hoped that 20,000 armed men would arrive at St. Giles in the Fields soon after midnight on January 7th, 1414. Someone, however, betrayed the place of rendezvous, and Henry, nothing if not prompt, shut the city gates so that the London contingent could not move. He, with men-at-arms, was on the ground when the first bands arrived, and they, mistaking in the darkness the royal forces for friends, were

³⁵ Fuller, *Worthies*, London 204 is wrong in stating that Badby suffered about 1401; Foxe, *A. and M.*, iii, 325 has the correct date, March 1409/10.

easily surprised and disarmed. The rest was easy. The conspiracy had been dangerous, but it ended in a fiasco. A revolution had been averted and only thirty-eight people suffered death.

It is not altogether surprising that later in the year a further act against the Lollards was passed. By it Justices of the Peace might on their own authority arrest persons defamed for heresy and hand them over to the Ordinaries of the Ecclesiastical Courts. This act compelled the bishops to try suspected heretics and under this act most of the burnings took place.³⁶

In reviewing these facts I cannot accept the legend of Foxe, though endorsed by Professor Trevelyan, of an ignorant brutal and bigoted priesthood persecuting pious people for their superior enlightenment. The professor appeals to the heresy trials which are on record, and triumphantly tells us that they contain no political charges.³⁷ Of course they do not, for an ecclesiastical court could not take cognizance of anything political. They had to restrict themselves to heresy, and the heresy with which they were most concerned was connected with the sacrament of the altar.

Wyclif's speculations about the eucharist belong to his closing years. When he published *De Dominio Civili* in 1377 he still believed in transubstantiation. In his *Confessio*,³⁸ 1381, he had given up that belief. In his *De Apostasia* (1381-2) he writes: "Christ is at once God and Man, so the Sacrament is at once the Body of Christ and bread—bread and wine naturally, the Body and Blood sacramentally."³⁹ This is consubstantiation. In the *Wycket*, if the *Wycket* be by him, he writes: "A sacrament is no more to say, but a sign or mind of a

³⁶ Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, iii, 391, 392.

³⁷ Trevelyan, *Age of Wyclif*, 340, App. 370.

³⁸ *Fasc. Ziz.*, 115 ff.

³⁹ Quoted Workman, ii, 38. cp. *Fasc. Ziz*, 122.

thing past."⁴⁰ It was the *Wycket* which became the *Vade Mecum* of the Lollards.

In his Latin works he never denied the Real Presence, though in speaking of it he availed himself of ambiguous distinctions, and sheltered himself behind so orthodox a writer as Hugo of St. Victor.⁴¹ His objection to transubstantiation was based on the impossibility of Accidents existing apart from Substance: an objection which St Thomas Aquinas had perceived long before, and for which he had not provided a very convincing answer.⁴² The difficult is really a verbal one, for it does not necessarily arise if we substitute the modern words Appearances and Reality for Accidents and Substance.⁴³

Whatever we may think of the doctrine of transubstantiation, we must deplore the time at which the discussion was reopened. It drove the ignorant but would-be-orthodox to express their faith in crude terms which the Lateran Fathers had meant to exclude. It drove the ignorant but proudly unorthodox into equally crude negations—while intending to oppose materialistic conceptions, they emptied the Sacrament of any spiritual content.

Some writers⁴⁴ have suggested that Wyclif's purpose was to cut at the root of sacerdotal power which depended on the belief that priests alone could consecrate the bread and wine to be the Body and Blood of our Lord; and that the opposition was concerned for the revenues of the church, which might disappear if men no longer valued the offering for the living and the dead. This is quite gratuitously to attribute base motives

⁴⁰ Workman, ii, 39. For authorship of *Wycket* see Lechler, 483. The *Wycket* remained the work of Lollardy—Strype, *Memorials*, I, ii, 53, 65. More, *Apology*, 186. Foxe, *A. and M.*, iv. 226, 241.

⁴¹ *Confessio, Fasc. Ziz*, 123.

⁴² *Summa*, Pt. iii, Q. 75, A. 5.

⁴³ Batiffol, *Eucharistie*, 486.

⁴⁴ Trevelyan, *Age of Wyclif*, 170; Lane Poole in Trail's *Social England*, ii, 170.

to both parties. Whatever we may think of Wyclif he was an honest man recklessly pursuing his argument unmindful of consequences. Even his adversaries saw this. Nicholas Love, the pious Carthusian of Mount Grace, writes:

Through his great learning and knowledge of philosophy he was deceived, in that he gave more credence to the doctrine of Aristotle, that standeth only in natural reason of man, than he did to the doctrine of the Holy Church and the true doctors thereof touching this precious Sacrament.⁴⁵

We have no reason to believe that his opponents were not equally honest. They may not have understood as well as he did Aristotle and the principles of Realism, but perhaps they had a clearer perception of the consequences of his teaching on the religion of the people. For them it was the Mass that mattered, and how much it mattered writers with nearly four centuries of Protestantism behind them fail to understand. It was the Lord's own service and the central fact in man's worship. It brought our Lord near to his people, and focussed their attention on him. It bridged the gulf between this world and the next, the living and the dead. In Jesus, believed to be present, the communion of saints became a reality. In a world of inequality and discord, the value of the individual soul was vindicated at the altar. There and there alone distinctions of race, class and culture were transcended and men were one. The action of the liturgy was intelligible to all, even though the language was in an unknown tongue. It was something all had in common. There was nothing to take its place—there never has been nor will be. It was not merely the dignity of the priesthood that was at stake, but the honour that all men everywhere owed to God's presence. It was not merely the wealth of the church which was threatened, but the cohesion of the worshipping community. The soul of the nation was in jeopardy.

⁴⁵ Nicholas Love, *The Mirror of the Blessed Life of Jesus Christ*, 316. Rashdall: *D.N.B.* says in very different language much the same thing.

Did Wyclif's learned friends ultimately understand this? We do not know, but anyhow they recanted. Philip Repyngdon died a cardinal of the Roman Church, John Aston wrote out a refutation of his heresies, but I cannot find he ever persecuted the faith he had once professed.⁴⁶ Nicholas Hereford, after thinking things out first in an English prison and then in another at Rome, submitted to authority, was restored to his chancellorship, obtained fresh preferment, and sat in judgment on his erstwhile associate, Walter Brut.⁴⁷ Fleming, the pert young regent at Oxford, whom an exasperated Arundel wished that he could "swap with a rod,"⁴⁸ lived to be Bishop of Lincoln, and carried out the decree of the Council of Constance, by exhuming and burning the remains of Wyclif. Even Purvey, Wyclif's closest friend, abjured him, obtained a benefice, and like other rectors, quarrelled with his parishioners over tithes,⁴⁹ but he at least could not cease from writing, with the consequence that he was soon in trouble again, left his living, and disappears from history. The cause of Lollardy was afterwards sustained by the unlettered poor.

This is exemplified by the case of Badby.⁵⁰ He was a tailor of Evesham, and was condemned as a heretic by the Bishop of Worcester early in 1409, but given a year for reconsideration. He apparently escaped from the diocese and found work in London, but was once more arrested in March, 1409/10,⁵¹ and tried before Archbishop Arundel and a strong

⁴⁶ Bale, *Cent.* iv, col. 170, says of Aston "Wickliffi optimi viri discipulus firmus perseveravit ad exitum. Vir vere Apostolicus et pius." Foxe also thought the same, probably misled by Bale, *A. & M.*, iii, 258. But his recantation can be read in *Fasc. Ziz.*, 231; also in *Knighton*, ii, 171.

⁴⁷ The Lollards called him the Master of the Nicolaitains. Foxe, *A. & M.*, iii, 188.

⁴⁸ Wylie, *Hist. of the Reign of Henry IV*, iii, 435.

⁴⁹ Foxe, *A. & M.*, iii, 257.

⁵⁰ The best and most accurate account is in Wylie, *Hist. of Henry IV*, iii, 437-440. He gives all the authorities.

⁵¹ Fuller, *Worthies*, London, 204, describes him as "an artificer in Blackfriars, London."

court of bishops and theologians. The archbishop was very patient, translating the Latin, and trying to explain in simple language what the doctrine of the church really was. Badby was contemptuous of any learning but his own, and unafraid of the awful fate he was courting. His mind was quite clear. "If priests could make the bread to be the body of Christ, then there were 20,000 Gods in England every morning, and he believed only in One." When faced with the words of institution he replied that "if he had heard Christ say, *This is my Body*, he should say *Christ spoke amiss*." The archbishop gave him another three days before passing sentence, but he then declared that "a spider and a toad were superior to the consecrated host, and more worthy of reverence, for they were alive." The archbishop had no option, He declared the man a heretic, and handed him over the secular power with an earnest petition that his life might be spared. In the then state of public opinion that was impossible, but the Prince of Wales himself came to Smithfield to see if by exhortation and promises he could not induce him to withdraw from "dangerous labyrinths of doctrine." He spoke in vain, but when the fire was lighted and Badby cried for mercy, the prince ordered the blazing faggots to be swept away, the man to be released from bonds and laid on the ground. Once more the prince offered him life and a pension, but Badby sat up and said he would rather burn. He was in consequence covered with a barrel and burnt to ashes. "The tailor," says Sir Charles Oman, "shewed higher heroism than that which won Agincourt."⁵² We agree, but for the future victor of Agincourt something should be said.⁵³ A prince had come to a tailor to save, if it were possible, his body in this life, and, as the prince thought, his immortal soul in the life to come. And we should not think evil of his unwilling persecutors. The Bishop of Worcester must have connived at his evasion and the Archbishop of Canterbury interceded on his behalf.⁵⁴

⁵² Oman, *Pol. Hist. of England*, iv, 223.

⁵³ Occleve.

⁵⁴ Lechler, 453, speaks of Arundel's "hypocritical request

When we read this and other lamentable stories we honour the heroism of those who died for their faith, we hate the law under which they suffered, but we dare not condemn the judges. Neither should Protestant writers make party capital out of these horrors. They should remember, that with Bishop Latimer's expressed approval,⁵⁵ more Anabaptists were burned under Henry VIII than Lollards in the fifteenth century⁵⁶—Anabaptists being indistinguishable from Lollards except in name. Neither should superior persons be too contemptuous of an age when good men were punished, for we have seen in our day politicians of goodwill trying to keep the Mahatma Gandhi out of prison, and failing to do so. We ought to pity the ecclesiastical rulers who had to deal with fanatics impervious to reason; while we pity the sufferings of the fanatics, who in the way of unreason, witnessed so bravely to the supremacy of conscience. Some seventeen people were burned to death for heresy during the fifteenth century, while a great number were summoned, recanted, and walked in penitential processions, carrying faggots.⁵⁷ But the persecution was very intermittent, and in most times and places Lollardy was blatant. Had it not been so we could not account for Pecock's famous book—*The Repression of Overmuch blaming of the Clergy*—a book written in popular language in answer to popular criticism. All through the century, bishops needed reminders that it was their duty to suppress strange opinions.

It was not only from *The Wycket*, *The Lantern of Life*, or *The Regimen of the Church*—all of them attributed to Wyclif—that the Lollards derived their strange opinions, but from that Bible which Wyclif believed to be its own interpreter. Some taught that the Jewish sabbath ought to be kept, and some that pork ought not to be eaten, and some that

⁵⁵ Latimer, *Sermons*, 160.

⁵⁶ Dixon, *Ch. Hist.*, i, 40.

⁵⁷ Stubbs, *Cont. Hist.*, iii, 394.

that he might not be put to death." Stubbs *Cont. Hist.*, iii, 390 is also doubtful of Arundel's sincerity.

pork was a suitable meal for a Friday in Lent. Some maintained, arguing from Abel, that men should only offer animals to God. Some in their desire for forbidden knowledge obtained not only the scriptures, but books of sorcery. Some said that there was no sacrament except marriage, and some that marriage was not sacrament. Some said that no bastard could be saved, and some that sexual sin was of little consequence. Some said that a child's baptism was invalid if either the priest or one of his sponsors was in mortal sin, some repudiated baptism. Some denounced war and capital punishment and approached to the doctrines of Quakers, and some objected to singing in church. They quoted I Peter iv, 12, as forbidding pilgrimages, and from I Cor. xiv, 28, derived their own title as "the known" men to be saved.⁵⁸

The Lollards had very little in common beyond a rooted hatred of the priesthood, a keen relish for ecclesiastical scandals, and a fervent belief that every scripture was for private interpretation. But we must not judge of the movement by its eccentrics. There were many who had revolted from the scandals in the church, many also were filled with a desire to read the scriptures in the only language which they understood. That was good, even though the desire was stimulated by the thought that "stolen waters are sweet," and even though the slaking of the thirst filled them with a sense of secret superiority. We have only a feeling of disgust when we read in Foxe of the ribald Nicholas Canon, and marvel that his profanity was so lightly punished.⁵⁹ We have but little sympathy for the truculent Margery Backster, who believed that the devils who fell from heaven with Lucifer had entered into the images of the church.⁶⁰ We feel quite differently for Nicholas Belward of Norfolk, who bought in London a New Testament for four marks and forty pence, which probably represented a lifetime's savings, and studied it diligently with William White and

⁵⁸ Capes, *Hist. of Ch. of Eng.*, XIV, XV, *Cents*, 192.

⁵⁹ Foxe, *A. & M.*, iii, 599.

⁶⁰ Foxe, *A. & M.*, III, 596.

Margery his wife, sometimes carrying it to the house of Thomas Moore, because he had a servant, John Pert, who could read well.⁶¹ These humble people were no doubt seekers after God.

It was for these good people that Reginald Pecock wrote his books in English, hoping "to reconcile Lollards to the church by better arguments than the fires of Smithfield."⁶² In his *Treatise on Faith*, he writes:

The clergy shall be condemned at the last day if by clear wit they draw not men into consent of true faith otherwise than by fire and sword and hangment, although I will not deny these second means to be lawful, provided the former be first used.⁶³

Having been a parish priest in London before becoming Bishop of St. Asaph, he knew the arguments of the Lollards, states them fairly, and then appeals not to authority but to reason.⁶⁴

Unfortunately he attempted to defend the indefensible—the unpreaching prelates and their absenteeism, the misapplied wealth of the church, the simoniacal contracts with the Pope, and the superstitious worship offered to images. A bishop, he argued, should devote himself to the deep problems of theology, and might leave to lesser men the elementary instruction of the people.⁶⁵ Again, it was charitable to suppose that a bishop outside his diocese was engaged on the wider interests of the church and people. It was true that many misapplied the wealth of the church, but that was no reason for confiscation, for they were only tenants for life, and their successors might spend the money to advantage.⁶⁶ It was impossible that any

⁶¹ Foxe, *A. and M.*, iii, 597.

⁶² Gairdner, *Lollardy and the Reformation*, i, 203.

⁶³ *Book of Faith*, edited by Morison, 139.

⁶⁴ In the *Book of Faith*, 202, he tells us how he had often spoken with the men who were esteemed "Dukes" among the Lollards, and "they have loved me because I would patiently hear their evidence, and their motives without exprobaton."

⁶⁵ Pecock's *Abbreviator* printed with *Repressor*, ii, 616, 617.

⁶⁶ Sermon at Paul's Cross.—Babington's *Introd.* xvi.

money paid to the Pope should involve simony, for the Pope was lord of all and any money paid to him was his own.⁶⁷ A man might believe that an image sweated, winked, spoke, heard prayers and worked miracles, but he was no idolater unless he believed that the image was God.⁶⁸ He turned with a smile on those who asserted that the Franciscans were hypocrites, because, forbidden to touch money, they counted it with a stick, and asked, Does counting it with a stick make them love money more?⁶⁹ He met the Bible men who wanted scriptural authority for everything by reminding them that in Holy Scripture only Aaron and his sons are commanded to wear breeches, and then comes the poignant question—How about the brewing of ale?⁷⁰

Yet Pecock was not without sympathy for the Bible man. He acknowledges that the Bible, especially the historical parts of the Old and New Testament, “is miche delectable and sweet, and draweth the readers into a devotion and love to God, and from love and deinté of the world.” But this does not excuse a conceit which despises learning and instruction.

Pecock himself was a thorough-going rationalist. He acknowledges indeed that from the Bible we learn some mysteries which transcend reason—the nature of God, the Incarnation and Redemption—but, he adds, we believe the Revelation when we see that it is reasonable. Otherwise the Bible bears witness to the Law of Kind, i.e., the Law of Nature; and, should there seem to be any conflict, the Bible must be harmonised with the Law of Kind, while the Law of Kind must not be forced into conformity with our understanding of Scripture.⁷¹ Again, he writes:

It belongeth not to any Scripture to ground any governance or deed of service of God, or any Law of God

⁶⁷ *Repressor*, i, 153, 154.

⁶⁸ *ibid.*, ii, 558, 559.

⁶⁹ *ibid.*, i, 118, 120.

⁷⁰ *ibid.*, i, 66.

⁷¹ *ibid.*, i, 25. 26.

or any truth which men's nature by reason may find, learn or know.⁷²

And again:—

If any man be feared that he trespass to God if he makes over-little of Holy Scripture which is the outward writing of the Old Testament and the New, I ask why he is not afearred lest he make over-little and apprise over-little the inward scripture of the before-spoken Law of Kind, written by God himself in man's soul, when he made man's soul to his image and likeness?⁷³

This, taken alone, might be interpreted in the Quaker sense of the Inward Light, but nothing was further from Pecock's thought. He abhorred mysteries and identifies God's gift of reason with the logical faculty, proclaiming it supreme.⁷⁴ The Law of Kind is recognised by "the doom of reason," but before that doom can be pronounced the facts must be known. That necessitates the study of moral and natural philosophy. Then if the rules of logic are observed the doom is final. He saw the answer to this—knowledge is limited and reasoning fallible, but he was not abashed. He says that hearing and sight are both defective, but we are bound to use them and trust them.⁷⁵ The same is true of Reason, and he adds, God will forgive involuntary error.⁷⁶ He would have agreed with Bishop Butler about Reason: "We have no other faculty to judge of anything, including Revelation."⁷⁷

Pecock therefore has no belief in the plenary inspiration of the poor humble man who reads his Bible. How could he

⁷² *Repressor*, i, 10. Pecock's sentence has been abbreviated.

⁷³ *ibid.*, i, 51.

⁷⁴ *Book of Faith*, 174. "A syllogism . . . having two premises openly true and to be granted, is so strong and so mighty in all kinds of matters, though all the angels in heaven would say that his conclusion was not true, yet we should leave the angels saying, and trust more to the truth of his syllogism."

⁷⁵ *Repressor*, i, 73.

⁷⁶ *ibid.*, i, 75.

⁷⁷ Butler, *Analogy*.

be humble if he despised the aid of "substantial clerks, well learned in logic and moral philosophy?"⁷⁸ He claimed for himself the right of private judgment, because he believed himself competent to exercise it, but he was not prepared to extend that right to the unlearned, for then "men should accord together as dogs do in a market place when each of them teareth other's coat."⁷⁹ He twits the Lollards with their schisms. Are there not among them those known as Doctor-mongers, Opinion-mongers, and Neutrals.⁸⁰ They claim indeed that God will reveal himself to "the true livers in his law," but, says Pecock, it is notorious that some of their most influential leaders are vicious men."⁸¹

A year after publishing *The Repressor*, Pecock was translated to Chichester and was soon engaged on *A Treatise on Faith*. In this book he made it clear that if he did not believe in the infallible Bible, still less did he believe in an infallible church. His leading thought he expresses as follows:

It was a shameful thing for the Christian church to hold such a faith for substance of its salvation, and yet not to suffer it to be examined: it were imputing a villainy to Christ that would give such a faith to his people, into which faith he would his people should turn all other people, and yet could not allow his faith to be full tried.⁸²

Faith, he maintained, was only probable, opinionial, and rarely sciential in this life.⁸³ Probability was our guide in life, but it was right to follow a teacher, who may fail, in so far as it is not known that he has failed.⁸⁴ On the other hand, General

⁷⁸ *Repressor*, i, 85.

⁷⁹ *Repressor*, i, 85, 86.

⁸⁰ *ibid.*, i, 87.

⁸¹ *ibid.*, 103.

⁸² *Book of Faith*, 132; *cp. Folewer to the Donet*, ed. by Hitchcock, Pt. i, ch. 14.

⁸³ *Book of Faith*, 140 ff.

⁸⁴ *ibid.*, 113. In the *Folewer to the Donet*, 62, he writes: "Faith is a knowing whereby we assent to anything as to truth,

Councils had erred and the Fathers had disagreed. Pecock, when asking for reasons, was not to be put off with authorities. When opposing divines quoted the Fathers, he replied: "Pooh! You are just as good teachers as they, and may just as well quote yourselves."⁸⁵ Again, he said of St. Jerome:

Certes, his tongue is not the key of heaven or of earth, neither had power to make anything true or false, or otherwise than he could find it to be true or false in Doom of Reason or of Holy Scripture.⁸⁶

He disagreed with the dictum of Gregory the Great: *Fides non habet meritum cui ratio humana praebebat experimentum*.⁸⁷ This was bad enough, but to his contemporaries what was far worse he scoffed at Duns Scotus. The Subtle Doctor had admitted that our Lord's descent into hell could not be proved by scripture, but declared it was of faith because the apostles had put the article into the creed. Pecock replied that the apostles did not write the creed which goes by their name, and that the article was not in the creed when St. Augustine lived, and in consequence the opinion of Scotus could not be maintained.⁸⁸ The restless brain of Pecock was never content. He even wrote a new creed, but it has not survived.⁸⁹

It will be seen that Pecock may have been orthodox, but his defence of orthodoxy was not on orthodox lines. He was a witty Welshman, quick to defend a truth or expose an error:

⁸⁵ Gascoigne: *Loci e Libro Veritatum*, 217. *Repressor*, ii, 623.

⁸⁶ *Repressor*, ii, 335.

⁸⁷ Gascoigne, 210: *Book of Faith*, 145.

⁸⁸ Babington, *Introductio to The Repressor*, p. 71, *cp. Book of Faith*, 303-305.

⁸⁹ Gascoigne, *Loci e Libro Veritatum*, 214.

for as much as we have sure evidence greater than to the contrary, that it is told and affirmed to us to be true, by him of whom we have sure evidence, or notable likely evidence, greater than to the contrary, that therein he not lied." In his *Reule of Christen Religium* ed. by Greet, 117, he teaches how we ought to be satisfied with probable truth as a guide for life.

dexterous when maintaining a bad cause, and ready to forgive anything but an *ignoratio elenchi*. We imagine him to have been a kindly man, for there is no word of bitterness in any of his writings. He certainly understood how to talk to the gallery, and being excessively vain, he expected them to wonder, laugh and applaud. Intellectual arrogance was his ruin.⁹⁰ Lords in the Council and unlearned bishops hated him for his all too conscious superiority.

It was an indiscreet letter to the Lord Mayor Canning on a political question that brought about his ruin. But it was never convenient to try a bishop for treason, so he was handed over to Archbishop Bouchier, who summoned him to appear with his books as one defamed for heresy. At first he was truculent and demanded to be tried by his peers in disputation and not by prelates unskilled in the schools. But very soon his courage failed, and he collapsed. He even listened meekly to the reproofs of George Neville, who had by Papal dispensation been appointed to the See of Exeter when far below the canonical age.

It was not long before the archbishop informed his "dear brother, Master Reginald," that he was like all "heretics blinded by the light of his own understanding," and that the time had come when he must recant or burn.⁹¹ Pecock, quite rightly, was not prepared to die for what were, after all, opinions rather than convictions, and so he braced himself to accept the disgrace. He recanted many things which he had never taught, and two propositions which were long afterwards affirmed to be true by the Council of Trent. He afterwards at Paul's Cross, in the presence of the multitude, cast three of his folios and eleven quartos into the fire, exclaiming against his own pride and presumption.

⁹⁰ An amusing instance of Pecock's belief in himself is to be found in *The Folewer*, 81.—"If thou wilt have stronger witness to the purpose than is the witness of Aristotle, look then, my son, into a sermon I made in Latin to the clergy."

⁹¹ Babington, *Introduction*, xliv.

He was then sent to prison, but managed to appeal to the Pope. Calixtus III ordered that he should be reinstated, but he was in the power of his enemies, and they compelled him to resign. Pius II—and no man had better reasons for forgiving literary indiscretions—tried to save him, and ordered that he should be sent to Rome. But the Pope was disobeyed and Pecock died in the monastery at Thorney, having been confined in “a secret close chamber” with “one sad person to make his fire and bed.”⁹² We do not suppose that his famous *Repressor* converted many Lollards, but it had all the merits required for a “best seller,” and a bitter chronicler remarks that “many infected by his pestiferous teaching remained in error.”⁹³ A little later, Edward IV wrote to Sixtus IV that Pecock’s writings were multiplied, and that not only the laity but churchmen and scholastic graduates scarcely studied anything else.⁹⁴ He had to be suppressed, and he was suppressed so successfully that this stalwart opponent of the Lollards is included by Foxe among his martyrs, and the *Index Expurgatorius* of Madrid describes him as a Lutheran Professor of Oxford.⁹⁵

⁹² *ibid.*, lvii.

⁹³ *Three Fifteenth Century Chronicles*, Camden Soc., 168.

⁹⁴ *C. S. P. Venetian*, i, 451. Quoted by Hitchcock, *the Donet*, xxv.

⁹⁵ Capes, *English Ch. Hist. XIV and XV Cents.*, 216. How completely Pecock was suppressed may be seen from the fact that Foxe, *A. and M.*, iii, 731, did not know that he wrote against the Lollards. He prints Bouchier’s citation and Pecock’s recantation, adding an article about the Blessed Sacrament. For the rest he translates verbally from Bale’s *Index Britanniae Scriptorum*, p. 337, and Bale depends entirely on Pecock’s enemy Gascoigne. Hall, *Chronicle*, 237, is even more ignorant. He thought Pecock got into trouble by lecturing at Oxford against Annates and Peters Pence. Parsons, the Jesuit, *Three Conversions of England*, Pt. iii, Calendar, Feb. 11, has the date 20 years wrong, and says that Pecock denied “three express articles of the Creed.” This too is untrue. Pecock rejected The Descent into Hell on critical grounds. He also affirmed that while we say, I believe in God—Father, Son and Holy Ghost, we only say we believe the Holy Catholic Church and the Communion of

His case has been worth considering at length, for it shows us Bibliolaters confronted by a Rationalist, and the church rooted, however unintelligently, in its age-long tradition. The church condemned Wyclif and condemned Pecock. Both were learned, abler and better men than their opponents, and yet in both cases the church was right. Wyclif had ample justification for denouncing the ecclesiastical abuses of his time, but Lollardy would have destroyed the church. Pecock had ample justification for upholding the claims of Reason, but by claiming that all questions were open for discussion he was imperilling the historic faith, and undermining the authority of the church as a teaching body with a gospel to deliver. The church after all exists for other reasons than to be a debating society.

The Wars of the Roses gave the chroniclers something more exciting to write about than the vagaries of Lollards, but that does not prove that Lollardy was extinct. Without organization, learning, or leaders of distinction there was little for history to record. The ordinary Englishman hated heresy and there was periodical alarm at the supposed increase of heretics, and the dangers that might be anticipated. Lollards were chiefly concentrated in London and the eastern counties, but they appear sporadically elsewhere. There was a carpenter in Somerset who believed that "a sinful man may never be damned through his sinful living, for then Christ must needs damn his own flesh and blood which he took of Mary the Virgin": and there were two Wiltshire clerics who abjured the usual negations.⁹⁶ In 1498 there was the heretic at Canterbury whom Henry VII converted, and to whom he gave a noble. About him the chronicler writes:

"This year in the beginning of May, the king being at Canterbury, was burnt an heretic, a priest, which by the king's exhortation before his death was converted from

⁹⁶ Jenkins, Morton's Register, *Tudor Studies*, 47.

Saints, but this distinction is approved in the *Tridentine Catechism*, de Symbolo, ix, 23.

his erroneous opinions and died a Christian man: whereof his grace got great honour.⁹⁷

On which Fuller comments, "If the king's converts had no better encouragement, this was the first he made and the last he was likely to make."⁹⁸

A year later the ambassador of Ludovico Sforza, wrote from London of a new sect of heretics who declared "baptism unnecessary for the children of Christians, marriage a superfluous rite, and the sacrament of the altar a fiction," but he adds, "the bishops have begun to persecute them."⁹⁹

Notwithstanding the cases of cruelty reported by Foxe at Amersham¹⁰⁰ and elsewhere Bacon was right in saying that proceedings against heretics were "rare in this king's reign and rather by penance than by fire."¹⁰¹

At the beginning of the reign of Henry VIII, Fitzjames, Bishop of London, began a heresy hunt, in which he discovered Hunne's Bible with all its "naughty" annotations.¹⁰² Foxe tells us of forty confessors between 1509 and 1527 in the London diocese, which included Essex; but he only tells us of heresies that would be accounted orthodox when Elizabeth was Queen. There were, he naïvely remarks, other and odious charges which he did not believe to be true, and would not weary his readers by repeating. The forty all abjured and did penance, by standing with faggots on their shoulders before Paul's Cross during sermon time, except Sweeting and Brewster, who were burnt as relapsed heretics.¹⁰³ This was

⁹⁷ Kingsford, *Chronicles of London*, 222. Gairdner, *Lollardy and the Reformation*, i, 274, points out that the man must have been burnt a week or ten days after the King left Canterbury.

⁹⁸ Fuller, *Church Hist.*, Bk. xv., 155

⁹⁹ *The Venetian Calender*, i, 799, Quoted Gairdner, *Lollardy and the Reformation*, i, 274, 275.

¹⁰⁰ Foxe, *A. and M.*, iv, 123 ff.

¹⁰¹ Bacon, *Henry VII*, 135.

¹⁰² More, *Dialogue*, Bk. iii, ch. 15.

¹⁰³ Foxe, *A. and M.*, iv. 18.

in 1511, and in the course of a gossiping letter, Ammonius wrote from London to Erasmus with sprightly exaggeration:

“I do not wonder that the price of faggots has gone up, for many heretics furnish a daily holocaust, and yet more spring up to take their place. And, so please you, the brother of my man Thomas—more a stick than a man—has not only started a sect, but has disciples.”¹⁰⁴

And Erasmus, loving warmth and yearning for a Dutch stove, wrote from Cambridge to say that with winter upon us he will hate heretics the more for raising the price of fuel.¹⁰⁵ Neither man was serious nor particularly interested; but we note that a burning had “news value”—neither man would have mentioned a hanging, for men were hanged every day.

Writing in 1533, Sir Thomas More tells Saint German that if he omits the dioceses of London and Lincoln he will not find four persons punished for heresy in five years, and in most dioceses not five in fifteen years, and not one handed over to the secular arm in twenty years. He acknowledges that in the London diocese twice as many heretics had been punished as in the rest of England, but he challenges Saint German to prove that any one of them suffered unjustly.¹⁰⁶

The diocese of Lincoln in those days included the counties of Lincoln, Leicester, Rutland, Northampton, Oxford, Buckingham, Huntingdon, Bedford, and part of Hertford. In 1521 John Longland became bishop. A pious, energetic man, a preacher, a reformer of abuses, and a hater of heresy. He found the county of Buckingham in a sad state. Nearly all the livings were appropriated and the vicars were wretchedly paid. Church life was at a low ebb, and Lollardy abounded. He obtained royal letters to all mayors, sheriffs and constables that they should co-operate with him in the suppression of heresy. Foxe gives us a list of fifty confessors who abjured and

¹⁰⁴ Erasmus, *Epistolae*, No. 239.

¹⁰⁵ Erasmus, *Epistolae*, No. 240.

¹⁰⁶ More, *Apologye*, 129, 130, *cp.* 167.

of four relapsed heretics who were burnt, and thinks that there were two others. All that can be said for certain is that one was burnt, that he too abjured at the stake and died, as the vicar of the parish said, "A Christian man." Subsequently Longland sent more than one man to the stake. He also greatly raised the religious life in the county, so that, at his second visitation, the words *omnia bene* are applied to many parishes which had been scandalous. How, then, are we to regard him? Very much as we regard a judge of assize to-day who puts on the black cap and condemns a criminal to death. Four hundred years hence men may regard capital punishment as we regard the burning of heretics, but the men then will be wrong if they stigmatise our present judges as inhuman monsters. No one need suppose that Longland liked burning heretics. To hand a relapsed heretic over to the secular authorities was no doubt painful to him, but he had a duty to perform and a law to administer.¹⁰⁷

Longland was, if you like, a persecutor, and so was Fitz-

¹⁰⁷ Foxe, *A. and M.*, iv, 219-246, gives very full particulars which he professes to have derived from Longland's Register, carefully quoting the folio where each fact may be found. Longland's Register exists, complete and in good condition, but not one of the facts is there. Foxe must therefore be referring to some other book no longer extant; and his facts cannot be checked. *V. H. C. Bucks*, i, 301, Foxe also gives many details which were told him on the spot forty years later; but they may be viewed with suspicion. We know how an intelligent peasantry would respond to the invitation, when they heard of a kind gentleman staying at the inn, with money in his pocket and a desire to sup on horrors. We can safely disregard the story that Scrivener's children were compelled to light the fire that consumed their father. How many were burnt? Sir Thomas More, *Apologye*, 105, writing ten years afterwards says one. Foxe, writing 40 years later says four certainly and probably two others. He does not profess to find these facts in the "Register." Fuller. *Worthies : Bucks*, writing with Foxe before him only tells of one, Scrivener. His next entry is concerned with another of Foxe's martyrs, and shows that he was alive many years afterwards. Lollard leaders had many aliases, and it is possible that Foxe's various informants told him the story of one man under different names.

james, but apart from them there seems to have been very little persecuting of Lollards on the eve of the Reformation. That, however, does not help us to know how many Lollards there were, or how much sympathy they excited; and it is, I believe, an error to suppose that the sect was all but extinct. Sir Thomas More, for instance, in his *Apologye* tells us of an attempt made by "a hundred men or above" to rescue a "known" heretic from the ordinary, and this implies that Lollards must have been fairly numerous.¹⁰⁸

When Tunstall, as Bishop of London, arrested "old father Hacker, alias Ebb" in 1527 the Lutheran movement had been going ten years in Germany, but the movement in which Hacker was a leader had a far longer history.¹⁰⁹ He saved himself by betraying his disciples, and they, arrested in turn, denounced others. We thus become acquainted with a society of *known* people with ramifications extending from London to Norwich. We also have light on the connexion between Lollardy and Protestantism. One Hiller was introduced to Friar Barron and showed him his old Wyclifite books, "which books the said friar did little regard and made a twyte of." The friar was a good salesman and Hiller, in consequence, paid three shillings and fourpence for Tyndal's edition of the Gospels. It was the Bible which was the link between Lollardy and the Reformation.

It may be concluded that the proportion of Lollards to the population was much the same as the proportion of Communists to the population to-day. In other respects there are analogies between the two parties. The Lollards were mostly poor men of the artisan class, but they had a few secret supporters, who were wealthy merchants or tradesmen. For the most part the ordinary Englishman knew about them, shook his head sadly when they were mentioned, and left them alone. Just as now someone starts a stunt about the subversive propaganda in Communist Sunday schools, so before the Reformation there

¹⁰⁸ More, *Apologye*, 178.

¹⁰⁹ Strype, *Memorials*, I, ii, 50-65.

were people who worked up suspicions of the evil designs of the Lollards. Then there would be raids, a search for papers and prohibited books, and an examination of those detected. Sometimes there were outbursts of fury against them for their profanity, indecent behaviour in church, demonstrations against popular worship, or sacrilege. Generally it was the more innocent members of the sect who were tried and punished on such occasions. The others got away. Lollards no doubt rejoiced when they heard of what Luther was doing in Germany, just as Communists rejoice over what they hear of happenings in Russia. No doubt they were ready to receive and shelter emissaries from Germany; but I do not suppose that they were interested in Lutheran theology, which was quite alien to their own, for they sympathized with Luther's enemies, the Anabaptists. It was the same class which provided most of the victims in Queen Mary's reign. They were the true descendants of the Lollards. They did not die for Lutheranism or Calvinism. They died protesting against the existence of a church and priesthood. They died maintaining that the Bible in the vernacular was all that was necessary for salvation. They died for the principle that of that Bible, every man was his own and sufficient interpreter.

H. MAYNARD SMITH.

ART. IV.—CHURCH AND STATE IN TERTULLIAN.

By his acceptance of the religion of Christ the Christian is brought into a new circle of relationships and duties while, at the same time, he is not emancipated from much that belongs to the old life. He is now subject to the law of the gospel and the discipline of the church; but he is not freed from his obedience to the law of the state and his allegiance to the civil authorities. Difficulties arise when the two are brought into conflict; then the lesser has to give way to the greater, no matter what hardship this may impose on the individual. The conduct of the Christian must in all respects conform to the divine law; he cannot temporise and remain faithful to the divine Master he has chosen. In certain respects the laws of the world are in opposition to the laws of the gospel; this opposition is not, however, essential, it does not inhere in the nature of the two, it is due merely to an imperfect development of secular law. In very many of the concerns of daily life there is no conflict, and the Christian is free to serve the state, and to become a better Christian by practising in the civil sphere the virtues which he is taught as a Christian.

Tertullian has a difficult task on his hands. Later on in his Montanistic days it would have been easier by far, for then there was no effort to keep a balance between church and world and he is wholly one-sided; but in his earlier work, as Moeller says,¹ "he attempts to demonstrate the full right of Christians to toleration, with full consciousness of the irreconcilability of the kingdom of God and the world." We find him pleading (Scap. 2) for religious toleration as based upon natural law and the right of every man.

The Christian is not hostile to the state as such, he is not

¹ *History of the Christian Church*, vol. i, pp. 203-204.

of anarchic or even of revolutionary tendencies; he seeks to better the state, to make its laws and its life conform more closely to the perfect law of the gospel and to the life of him whose the gospel is. This ideal is to be realized not by the destruction of existing conditions, but by their reformation. So the Christian prays for the preservation of the Emperor and for the well-being of the state (Apol. 39). He fulfils all the duties which come to him as a citizen, except in those cases in which fulfilment would make him disobedient to the faith; then there is imperfection in the laws of the state, denoting an immature or harmful development. His religion bids him render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's.² The logic of events proves the truth of the thesis of Tertullian; only a little more than a century was to pass before the Empire became, nominally at least, Christian, and the Emperor continued on his throne and the civil power remained unshaken. It would seem that what the state feared, so far as it could anticipate the future, was the development of that line of thought, crystallised into action, which brought Henry III to Canossa, led John of England to lay down his crown at the feet of Innocent III, and finds its fullest expression in the Bull of Boniface, "Unam Sanctam." Tertullian, on the other hand, has the same conception of the "two swords" which S. Augustine expounded in *De Civitate Dei*; a conception which no state has need to fear, except as it loves that which is evil and abhors that which is good.³ The civil authority in the days of Tertullian had not thought all this out, and was undoubtedly moved primarily by a blind, childish, unreasoning hatred of that which it could not understand.⁴ Tertullian has an uncharted

² *adv. Marc.*, 4, 38; *Scorp.*, 14; *Idol.*, 15; *Fuga*, 12.

³ But cf. Guignebert as quoted in D'Alès, *La Théologie de Tertullien*, p. 403, note 3. A century and a half later S. Optatus, moved by the exigencies of the Donatist controversy, strongly expressed the superiority of the civil sword: "For the state is not in the church, but the church is in the state, that is to say, in the Roman Empire. . . . There is no one superior to the Emperor excepting God alone (who made the Emperor)."

⁴ cf. D'Alès, *op. cit.*, p. 423.

sea to navigate, thickly strewn with the rocks of existent facts, among which the bark of the church sails with difficulty.⁵ Necessarily he must be a reformer, but in his most outspoken moments it is not easy to apply to him the title of revolutionist.

In detail—the Christian pays the taxes which the government imposes, so says Speratus, one of the martyrs of Scillita;⁶ he serves in the army. In his orthodox days Tertullian says that Christians were numerous in the army⁷: “*navigamus et nos vobiscum, et vobiscum militamus . . . implevimus castra ipsa*” (Apol. 37); and he does not blame them for this service (Apol. 42). Later on he reverses this position and concludes⁸ that the military oath of allegiance (*sacramentum*) is impossible to one who at his baptism took the oath of allegiance to Christ; “in disarming Peter our Lord disarmed all soldiers.” The Christian is not guilty of treason: “Treason is falsely laid to our charge, though no one has ever been able to find followers of Albinus, or Niger, or Cassius, among Christians. . . . A Christian is enemy to none, least of all to the Emperor of Rome, whom he knows to be appointed by his God, and so cannot but love and honour. . . . To the Emperor, therefore, we render such reverential homage as is lawful for us and good for him; regarding him as the human being next to God who from God has received all his power and is less than God alone” (Scap. 2). “No conspiracy has ever broken out from

⁵ *ibid.*, p. 424, note 1.

⁶ But Dr. Bigg, *The Church's Task under the Roman Empire*, p. 128, quotes Speratus as saying: “*Ego imperium huius saeculi non cognosco.*” There are two lines of thought and each must be read in its own context; thus Tertullian on this side says: “*Nec ulla magis aliena res est quam publica*” (Apol. 38), and “*christianus nec aedilitatem adfectat*” (Apol. 46); cf. Min. Felix. Octav., 8, “*honores et purpuras despiciunt.*”

⁷ Cor. i; cf. D'Alès, *op. cit.*, p. 415, note 4.

⁸ Cor. ii; cf. Idol., 19-20. Lact., Div. Inst., v, 12-13, 16; vi, 16, 20, also forbids military service, perhaps because of the use to which the army was put in his time, that of persecuting Christians. Generally speaking the church agreed with the earlier thought of Tertullian.

our body; no Caesar's blood has ever fixed a stain upon us, in the senate or even in the palace; no assumption of the purple has ever in any of the provinces been effected by us" (Ad. Nat. I. 17). Christians are not guilty of any irreverence or disrespect towards the authorities of the state; when the pagans retort: "If not in arms, you are in tongue at all events always rebellious" (Ad. Nat. I: 17), they are giving utterance to their prejudices, not expressing an actual fact.

The thesis of his greatest work, the *Apologia*, is that no accusation is brought against Christians, only the name itself is condemned by those who do not condescend to examine the matter. The Christians ask only an examination of their cause (Apol. I; Ad. Nat. I: 1). They are victims of an ignorant hatred. The privilege allowed all offenders to plead their defence is denied to Christians alone, who are called upon to deny the name and go free: "*Illud solum expectatur—confessio nominis, non examinatio criminis.*"⁹ All enquiry into the circumstances is forbidden. Once, however, there had been an examination, and Tertullian refers to the records for the testimony of Pliny who could find nothing against those brought before him charged with the offence of being Christians, save the innocent practice of the teachings of their religion, which itself forbade the offences for which men were brought to trial by the state. To Pliny Trajan had made the strange response that Christians were not to be sought out, but if denounced to him were to be punished. The state thus connived with wrong doing—if Christianity were wrong. Their assailants bring against them no concrete charge but the bare assertion, "*non*

⁹ H. Gwatkin, *Early Church History to A.D. 313*, vol. i, p. 123, notes here a flaw in the logic of Tertullian which is often overlooked: "Tertullian raises the captious difficulty that while other malefactors are pressed to confess crime, the Christians are pressed to deny it. He chooses to forget that the object of the court is to make a grievously suspected person disavow secret treason, so that it was not unjust to punish him if he replied with open treason."

licet esse vos." There is some reason to believe that this may actually contain the substance of a law issued against the Christians, probably by Nero if the conjecture of its issue has any foundation.¹⁰ But, on the whole, the opinion of Mommsen, who thinks that there was no general law directed against them and that ordinarily the treatment accorded them depended upon the local magistrate as a matter of police administration, seems the true view.¹¹ Pliny's letter makes it clear that he knew of no law. They came, of course, under the general law of the Twelve Tables, which forbade the worship of gods unauthorized by the state, but this had fallen into abeyance and would scarcely be invoked. "At the same time other laws might also afford ground for legal procedure, such as the *lex Julia majestatis*; the *crimen laesae majestatis* could be incurred not only by actual rebellion, but also by *verbis impiis*, *murmuratione contra felicitatem temporum*, and also by secret nightly assemblies."¹² Monceaux¹³ discusses the question of the existence of a general law applicable against the Christians; he says that Tertullian treats the subject with his profound knowledge of Roman Law and even shows in his treatment the "flair d'avocat," and comes to the conclusion that Tertullian traces back to an Edict of Nero all the proceedings against the Christians.¹⁴ Among modern writers Boissier and Allard agree with Tertullian, if this last conjecture is right, in tracing the legal basis of the proceedings back to Nero.

¹⁰ See D'Alès, *op. cit.*, pp. 386-388.

¹¹ See W. Hobhouse, *The Church and the World in Idea and in History*, p. 50, note.

¹² Moeller, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 160. Moeller is in error in protracting the period during which Christianity grew *sub umbraculo religionis licitae* (Apol. 20) until the Jewish religion ceased to be a *religio licita*, for the distinction between Christians and Jews had been clearly made before the Jewish War resulted in the withdrawal of legal recognition from the Jewish religion.

¹³ *Histoire Littéraire de l'Afrique Chrétienne*, vol. i, pp. 223-226.

¹⁴ Apol. 5; Ad. Nat. i, 7; Scorp. 15; cf. Euse., H.E., ii, 25, iii, 3, iv. 26; Lact. de Mort. Pers. 2.

Does the law, asks Tertullian, denying them the right to existence rest upon a reasonable foundation? If not, let them abrogate it, as they are daily abrogating other laws which have served their purpose, or which the passage of time has proven unjust. Justice alone gives laws the right to exist, not mere antiquity, "*legis injustae honor nullus*" (ad Nat. I: 6). There is no foundation in justice or in reason for the laws enforced against them (Apol. 5; ad Nat. I: 10; adv. Marc. I. 18), which forbid the Emperor to consecrate a new god without the consent of the Senate; rather it is a matter worthy only of ridicule—that there is no god unless his existence is allowed by men. One sees on every side evidence that this law has fallen into deserved desuetude for the Empire is flooded with new gods; against the Christians only does any one think of alleging it: "*laudatis semper antiquitatem, et nove de die vivitis.*"

On two charges alone Tertullian with his legally trained mind perceives that there is any possible ground for their condemnation, disloyalty to the state and sacrilege, and undertakes to prove their innocence on both counts.

Deeper than these, however, beyond the reach of law, were the effects of the very spirit of Christianity, the change in social life and habit which it introduced; real also, although far less important, its effect upon certain lines of trade, a fact which had become manifest in New Testament times, and, finally, its own aggressiveness and intolerance, which could not permit it to be placed on an equality with other religions as one of a class. Men generally would repeat against the Christians the accusation which had been recorded in the Acts, "that they turned the world upside down." It is very likely that the enmity came from the people and that the government, often wholly indifferent to the cause itself, interfered simply to conciliate the people and to keep them in good humour. Difficult situations locally might often be bridged over by diverting the thought of the people, and yielding to, or even stimulating, the popular cry "*Christianos ad leones.*" We note also a *vis inertia* in laws which served no particular interest;

"many laws were inoperable unless private initiative set them in motion."¹⁵ In Apol. 37 we have an example of mob action against Christians; in Scap. 3, 4, 5, of persecutions which were due to personal spite.

It may be well for us here to examine Tertullian's method of defence. He inaugurated a new type of apologetic due, in the first place, to his own characteristics, but evidencing also a new attitude of Christianity towards the state, an attitude which made it potentially a more dangerous enemy—not a plea for toleration, but an assertion of its rights, a demand to be heard in its own defence, accompanied by an assault upon the position of its opponents. "*Cela fit entrer la polémique religieuse dans une phase nouvelle: Mélicon aboutissait à une pastorale, Théophile à un concordat. L'Apologetique de Tertullien eût pour premier résultat d'écarter l'ancienne méthode apologetique.*"¹⁶ P. Monceaux¹⁷ examines the strength and the weakness of the apologetic method of Tertullian; he concludes that it failed in its primary purpose and attempts to reconstruct the impression which it would have made upon an intelligent and honest magistrate of the time. He thinks that he would have been repelled by the attack upon paganism, that the appeal to the Bible would have meant nothing to him, and that the fact that Tertullian had strayed from his premise—to sustain the defence solely upon the ground of legality, would have determined his decision against him. The Apology would reveal to him a religion more dangerous than he had imagined, aggressive, intransigent, sworn enemy to all the traditional religions; a religion menacing what he regarded as the well-being of the state. He would admire the talent and eloquence of the writer as well as his daring, but would be confirmed in his original opinion and would see more clearly the impossibility of granting the tolerance for which the writer pleaded, a toler-

¹⁵ Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 325.

¹⁶ LeClercq, *L'Afrique Chrétienne*, vol. i, p. 125, note 1.

¹⁷ *Op. cit.*, vol. i, pp. 247-253.

ance which all that he says make abundantly clear would never satisfy him. Christianity could justify itself only in triumphing.

Following his method in some detail we find that Tertullian examines the various offences with which his co-religionists are charged (Apol. 7-9) and proves them innocent of all, as their assailants themselves admit by their failure to bring forth proof. First he dwells upon the secret offences (*occulta facinora*) alleged against them. The Christian *agapes* are regarded as hideous Thyestean feasts¹⁸ in which incest and cannibalism are looked upon as virtues. But of this the accusers have no proof whatever, the charge rests upon mere report. There is no evidence of a single eye-witness produced. Somewhat inconsistently Tertullian argues that no human being could be guilty of the acts with which the Christians are charged, and then brings the same charge against the accusers. The Christians, he adds, are bound by their laws to refrain from eating even the blood of animals;¹⁹ and, in opposition to incest, the Christians are bound to the strictest chastity. The open offences—*manifestiora facinora*—alleged against them occupy more space in his refutation; impiety is refuted and, incidentally, a considerable portion of Christian doctrine is expounded (Apol. 10-27), while the charge of disloyalty is shown to be false (Apol. 28-45). Sacrilege, as urged against the Christians, has the meaning of atheism, *crimen irreligiositatis* (Apol. 10), and the accusation "*Deos non colitis*,"²⁰ indicates this. Rome was tolerant enough from her point of view, an individual might

¹⁸ The present writer ventures the conjecture that this accusation may have had its origin in the association of Eucharistic doctrine, of which the accusers had heard vague rumours, with the equally vague reports which came to them of agape practices. Allusions to these charges occur repeatedly in the Apologists. For the frequent references in Jus. Mar., see Otto's note to Apol. i, 10; Athanagoras, Leg. 3, 31; Ep. ad Diog. 5; Euse., H. E. 5, 1.

¹⁹ Apol. 9. This may be the only evidence of the continued observance of the decision of the Council of Jerusalem, Acts 15, on the subject.

²⁰ The same charge is answered by Arist. 15; Jus. Mar., Apol. i, 13; Athanagoras, de Leg. 4; Thoep. ad Autoly. i, 2.

worship whatever god he chose provided only that he was willing to worship the officially recognised gods also; but this was the condition that the Christians could not accept and that brought against them the charge of sacrilege. There was also ground for the charge in the fact that the Romans generally had no conception of a religion which did not have a tangible object, an image to worship. Tertullian undertakes to show the absurdity of the charge as brought against the Christians. They do not worship the idols or take part in Caesar worship it is true, but this is because they know that an idol is nothing at all beyond material substance, and they cannot join in Caesar worship because the Emperor is a man, not a god. The Emperor is to be honoured and served in every proper way, but he is not to receive that which belongs to God alone. In opposition to the false gods of polytheism he sets forth the true God, the God of the Christians, the God to whom their truest and innermost conscience bears its instinctive witness. In passing he notices and refutes²¹ the absurd charge of Tacitus, "*sane ille mendaciorum loquacissimus*," that the Christians worship the head of an ass. He retorts upon his adversaries the charge of impiety, from which he has freed his associates, and eloquently and aggressively carries the war into their camp. The second class of open offences is not readily separated from the first for, as D'Alès remarks, Caesar worship makes lèse-majesté become lèse-divinité, and so the Christian apologist has a delicate task upon his hands in vindicating the loyalty of his co-religionists. His adversaries reply to his arguments: "In denying to the Emperor the divine honour which is his due, you become a rebel." Tertullian sets before them their inconsistencies: they take an oath far more willingly by all the gods than by the Emperor, and this is not strange, for a living Caesar counts for more than all the dead, non-existent gods; but, on the other hand, we Christians pray to the only true living God for the safety of the Emperor, to the God who made the Emperor man and bestowed upon him his empire, and from our

²¹ Apol. 16; ad Nat. i, 11, 14.

prayers for him you tear us away and summon us before your tribunals. Three considerations which we cannot fail to heed urge us to these prayers: our scripture, which is the word of God, makes it a duty; the end of the world is near, this will mean the failure of Rome to fulfil its destiny, and we pray that this may be averted until all are ready; finally we pray for the Emperor because we recognise in him the chosen one of God.²²

There is then, we may conclude, no valid ground for the persecutions and the general attitude towards Christians. The reasons alleged are too vague to admit precise definition. At the same time it is only fair to note that Christianity did affect vitally three institutions about which its views would be most conspicuous: 1. the household, the relations of husband and wife, of parent and child, of master and slave; 2. the municipality; 3. the State.²³ Christian morals, because they were Christian, were necessarily in opposition to those of the world; there could be no compromise and friction was inevitable until the morals of the church had become, at least nominally, those which guided men generally. Monceaux's suppositious magistrate had come to the only possible conclusion. As Sir William Ramsay has said:²⁴ "The church may be, roughly speaking, described as a political party advocating certain ideas which, in their growth, would have resulted necessarily in social and political reform."

To return to the individual in his relation to the state as this relation was effected by his religion. Christianity makes men law-abiding citizens. By their allegiance to the laws of their religion they are impelled to the observance of the laws of the state; they are free from the ordinary offences which bring men to trial and punishment; Christians are found in the prisons and mines only because they are Christians, none are

²² Apol. 30-37; Scap. 1-5.

²³ Dr. Bigg examines these consequences of the Christian religion at length, *Origins of Christianity*, pp. 324-330.

²⁴ *The Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 10.

brought to trial upon any of the ordinary charges.²⁵ "We, then, alone are without crime. Is there ought wonderful in that, if it be a very necessity with us? For a necessity indeed it is. Taught of God himself what goodness is, we have both a perfect knowledge of it as revealed to us by a perfect Master; and faithfully we do his will, as enjoined on us by a judge we dare not despise."²⁶ "You have never detected us—sacrilegious wretches though you reckon us to be—in any theft, far less in any sacrilege."²⁷ "No name of a crime stands against us, but only the crime of a name."²⁸ "Nor are we betrayed by anything else than our own goodness, just as bad men also become conspicuous by their own badness."²⁹ Unhappily this is not true of all, as Tertullian admits: "As to your saying of us that we are a most shameful set, and utterly steeped in luxury, avarice, and depravity, we will not deny that this is true of some. It is, however, a sufficient testimonial for our name, that this cannot be said of all, not even of the greater part of us . . . The goodness of the larger portion is well attested by the slender flaw."³⁰ Even the morals of the clergy were not always all that they should have been. An abundance of evidence of a later date bears witness to this fact,³¹ hence we may infer that in the earlier period there was some warrant for that which he says on the subject³² and, to a certain extent, for his Montanism, for we may take it for granted that he was ignorant

²⁵ Apol. 44 ; Scap. 4.

²⁶ Apol. 45 ; *cf. ibid.* 38.

²⁷ Scap. 2.

²⁸ ad. Nat. i, 3.

²⁹ ad. Nat. i, 4.

³⁰ ad Nat. i, 5.

³¹ We may omit the evidence of S. Jerome as biassed. S. Aug., de Bapt. c. Don. 7 ; 45 (89) ; 4, 9 (12) ; c. Epp. Parm. 3 ; 2 (8) ; *cf.* canons 18-20 of Con. Elib., 305-306 A.D. ; canon 13, Con. Carth., 248 A.D. ; S. Cyp., Ep. 2. S. Aug., de Fide Rerum quae non Videntur, 11, "Evil Christians, enemies by so much the more hurtful, as they are the more within us."

³² Idol. 7, 9.

of the equally great, if not greater, immoralities charged against the Montanist leaders. We may add to what he says above the charge he brings against a bishop of the church, accusing him of personal moral looseness: "the Bishop of Utina feared not the Scantinian Law."³³ But these are exceptions, the authorities themselves bear witness to the purity of the Christians: "Very lately in condemning a Christian woman to the brothel (*leno*) rather than to the lion (*leo*) you made confession that a taint on our purity is considered among us more terrible than any punishment and any death."³⁴

No matter how cruelly and unjustly treated the Christians take no revenge for their injuries. After enumerating some of the outrages to which Christians are subjected, Tertullian continues: "Yet, banded together as we are, ever so ready to sacrifice our lives, what single case of revenge for injury are you able to point to, though, if it were held right among us to repay evil by evil, a single night with a torch or two could achieve an ample revenge."³⁵ Moved to vengeance the great numbers of those who confess the faith, together with their heedlessness of death, would constitute a menace to the Empire. Even a general flight of the Christians beyond the Emperor's reach would depopulate the Empire: "In the very forsaking vengeance would be inflicted. Why, you would be horror-struck at the solitude in which you would find yourselves, at such an all-prevailing silence, and that stupor as of a dead world. You would have to seek subjects to govern."³⁶

In idol worship and Emperor worship the Christians could, of course, not join with their neighbours. Nor could they take oaths in the courts, or in civil matters generally; they could not swear by the Emperor's genius, but by his safety.³⁷ It appears that our Lord's prohibition of oath taking was

³³ Mon. 12; the law was directed against pederasty.

³⁴ Apol. 50.

³⁵ Apol. 37; cf. Scap. 5.

³⁶ Apol. 37.

³⁷ Apol. 32.

understood literally and absolutely,³⁸ but, in any case, the fact that the oath was taken by some pagan deity would make it impossible for a Christian. The holding of state offices was incompatible with Christianity;³⁹ this incompatibility was due chiefly to the necessity of taking part in state pagan services, but also to the fact that the insignia and pomp of public office were unbecoming to one who at his baptism had renounced the pomps and vanities of this world.⁴⁰ While capital punishment is not explicitly forbidden by the gospel,⁴¹ Christians ought not to sit as judges,⁴² for the sentence of the court is only "*justitiam saeculi*";⁴³ "*Saeculum Dei est, saecularia autem diaboli*";⁴⁴ "*nam daemonia magistratus sunt saeculi*."⁴⁵ Christians ought not, moreover, to be present when the sentence is inflicted.⁴⁶

The true Christian service to the state is that of prayer,⁴⁷ loyalty, obedience, and almsgiving.⁴⁸ The true Christian is to manifest the reality of his faith by charity: "*Itaque qui animo animaque miscemur, nihil de rei communicatione dubitamus; omnia indiscreta sunt apud nos, praeter uxores*."⁴⁹ To charity are added the theological virtues of faith and hope, the moral

³⁸ Idol., II, 17, 20-23.

³⁹ Apol. 31, 38, 46; but cf. Apol. 37, "*implevimus . . . senatum*." See also D'Alès, *op. cit.*, p. 423, note I.

⁴⁰ Spect. 12; Idol. 17, 18.

⁴¹ de An. 56.

⁴² Idol. 17.

⁴³ de An. 33.

⁴⁴ Spect. 15.

⁴⁵ Idol. 18.

⁴⁶ Spect. 19.

⁴⁷ Before the days of Tertullian the martyrs of Scillita had replied when examined: "We respect, fear and venerate our Emperor, for whom we offer a daily sacrifice."

⁴⁸ On Christian charity in general *vide* Apol. 39; cf. S. Cyp. Epp. 2, 5, 7, 12, 14; Cornelius of Rome, *apud* Euse., H.E. 6, 43; S. Aug., Epp. 185, 35. 122, 2.

⁴⁹ Apol. 39.

virtues of patience and chastity, the discipline of fasting and penitence. The goal of the Christian life is that by it God's holy name may be sanctified,⁵⁰ that his will may be done on earth as it is in heaven;⁵¹ to accomplish these things the Christian strives, suffers and, if need be, dies.

In his treatise *de Idolatria* Tertullian wrote the first essay on the subject of idolatry as it affected the every-day life of the Christian. Idolatry was so interwoven with the texture of daily life that the Christian was necessarily debarred from many occupations. Concerning the general intercourse with the pagans we may compare what is said in *de Idolatria* 14 and *de Cultu Feminarum* ii, 11. On the social side we find a greater liberality than we might anticipate: the Christian is not entirely shut off from association with his pagan neighbour, even when pagan rites are offered, if these rites are incidental, as at a marriage feast or the naming of a child.⁵² As Monceaux comments, Tertullian for once "*dans un accès d'indulgence acceptée un compromis.*"⁵³ The Christian could not take part in such customs as those of hanging garlands or lamps at the door on account of the associations behind these customs.⁵⁴ In *de Idolatria* we discover how many occupations the Christian might not enter on account of their association with idolatry: he cannot be a maker of idols (4-8), he cannot build or in any way adorn idol temples or altars (8), he cannot be an astrologer (9), or a schoolmaster, because teaching the heathen mythology would be a necessary part of his occupation (10). As a merchant he could not trade in any commodity used in idolatrous worship (11); as a banker he could not receive or pay money on the days legally appointed, because these days were dedicated to one or another of the heathen gods (13); moreover,

⁵⁰ *de Orat.* 3.

⁵¹ *ibid.*, 4.

⁵² *Idol.* 16; *cf. de Cult. Fem.* ii, 11.

⁵³ *Op. cit.*, vol i, p. 283.

⁵⁴ *Idol.* 15.

interest ought not to be taken on money loaned.⁵⁵ Generally business was condemned because its usual motive—to acquire wealth—was most unchristian, it fostered cupidity and lying, which is the servant of cupidity (11). Yet Tertullian does not entirely forbid it, though his general position makes it almost impossible. The treatise, as he shows by examples, is not academic, but is provoked by the fact that Christians, even clerics (7), are doing the very things that their religion prohibits.

Christians could not attend the games because they were instituted and continued in honour of some one of the gods; therefore attendance involved the Christian in the risk of idolatry.⁵⁶ Tertullian admits frankly⁵⁷ that he finds no explicit condemnation of attendance in holy scripture, but he sets himself the task of bringing forth an implicit condemnation and, by a tortuous and erroneous exegesis, makes Psalm i, 1, serve his purpose. He finds a safer ground, however, for his condemnation in the admitted fact that the games are inseparable from idolatry, and discovers an acknowledgement of this even in pagan writers.⁵⁸ He gives five reasons for his belief that the games are of the devil: 1. their origin, 2. the names which they bear, 3. the ceremonies that accompany them, 4. the places where they are held, 5. the programme of the representations.⁵⁹ They are wholly associated with the things that the Christian has renounced at his baptism;⁶⁰ to attend them is to attempt to combine the service of two masters, and involves a denial of one's faith. Even the pagans acknowledge this and decide that one has become a Christian when he is no longer seen at the games,⁶¹ and the demons justly assert their claim upon those

⁵⁵ *adv. Marc.* 4, 17.

⁵⁶ *Spect.* 4 ; *cf.* *Apol.* 38.

⁵⁷ *Spect.* 3.

⁵⁸ *ibid.* 5, 7, 9.

⁵⁹ *ibid.* 4-12.

⁶⁰ *ibid.* 13, 24, 26.

⁶¹ *ibid.* 24.

whom they find there.⁶² There are three reasons why a Christian cannot attend, either of which alone should be sufficient: divine prohibition,⁶³ the immorality which reigns there,⁶⁴ and the idolatry.⁶⁵ Inward peace is the goal of the Christian, strong pleasures are inconsistent with the attainment of the goal.⁶⁶ The games are forbidden because they arouse the passions, and because the whole environment is unsuited to perseverance in the Christian life.⁶⁷ The Christian does not need the excitement of the games to divert him, in his faith he has the source of better joys and finer spectacles than those which the theatre or the arena afford.

Before we condemn the Christian of that day and Tertullian in particular for intolerance—and so fall into an all too common error—we should allow for the horror with which they would see the worship due to God only transferred to idols, idols which personified much that was most evil in the daily life of the time. The newly-made convert must be protected and placed as far as possible beyond the reach of this evil.⁶⁸ That which makes all things important, small or great, significant or apparently insignificant, is the reference of all to the central authority of Christ.⁶⁹ Idolatry, he finds, eats like a cancer into the whole of life and takes away its soundness; it is a fecund mother of all sin. The confessor shut up in the prison for the faith may be thankful that he in his enforced isolation has protection from the sin without the prison walls where idolatry reigns supreme.⁷⁰

It was a degenerate age in which Tertullian lived⁷¹ and he, as a Christian, had to set his face sternly against many of the

⁶² *ibid.* 26.

⁶³ *ibid.* 3.

⁶⁴ *ibid.* 14-23.

⁶⁵ *ibid.* 4-13, 24-27.

⁶⁶ *ibid.* 15, 25.

⁶⁷ but *cf.* *Apol.* 42.

⁶⁸ *ad. Mar.* 2; *de Cor.* 10.

⁶⁹ *de Cor.* 15.

⁷⁰ *ad Mar.* 2.

⁷¹ *Apol.* 6.

corrupt practices of the time: as, *e.g.*, abortion,⁷² infanticide.⁷³ Individual life was held at a very low value, as shown by the great slaughter in the arena which, in turn, fostered cruelty generally.⁷⁴ Christianity's task was to enlarge the conception of the worth of the individual life.

Life in its entirety can never be altogether corrupt, there is a dissatisfaction with things as they are to which Christianity makes its appeal, and through which it is enabled to manifest its converting power by showing men the more excellent way⁷⁵ which, blindly, they have been seeking.

Christians can never be misanthropes, they did not merit the charge which Tacitus had brought against them—haters of the human race; yet Tertullian is not optimistic as to the race's future, he is not very hopeful of the establishment of the reign of Christ in this world and the acceptance of his laws as those of its life; towards this end the Christian is to labour, but he is always to remember that this world is not his real home. "But as for you, you are a foreigner in this world, a citizen of Jerusalem, the city above. Our citizenship, the Apostle says, is in heaven. You have your own registers, your own calendar; you have nothing to do with the joys of the world; nay, you are called to the very opposite, for 'the world shall rejoice, but ye shall mourn.'"⁷⁶ He knows that the Christians belong to a "third race,"⁷⁷ and does not look for the time in this world when this shall cease to be a characteristic distinction of those who profess the faith and live the lives of followers of Christ. The great care of the Christian in this

⁷² ad Nat. i, 15. Tertullian allows, however, the practice of craniotomy (de An. 25), which the church of later days has usually condemned in favour of the Caesarean operation.

⁷³ Apol. 9; ad Nat. i, 15; de Vel. Virg, 14; de Ex. Cast. 12. Oehler, *Tertulliani Opera Omnia*, vol. i, p. 136 note, gives the references to the practice in Tertullian's predecessors.

⁷⁴ S. Cyp., ad Don. 7, has an affecting passage.

⁷⁵ Apol. 3; cf. ad Uxor. ii, 7.

⁷⁶ de Cor. 13; cf. Apol. 38 and Ep. ad Diog. 5, 6.

⁷⁷ "*Usque quo genus tertium*," Scorp. 10; "*plane, tertium genus dicimur*," ad. Nat. i, 8; cf. Clem. Alex., Strom. vi, 5; Arist. Apol. 2.

world is to prepare himself for his exit from it; the chief means of preparation are to break with it now, to practise detachment.⁷⁸

FRANK H. HALLOCK.

⁷⁸ de Spect. 28 ; de Idol. 24.

ART. V.—THE SPIRIT IN THE PAULINE EPISTLES.

AT Antioch the followers of Christ were first called Christians. This title does not seem to have met with the approval of the Christians themselves. One may perhaps see in I Cor. i, 12, the reason for St. Paul's avoidance of the title: some were calling themselves "of Paul," others "of Apollos," others "of Peter," and others "of Christ" or, possibly, Christians. The titles being a source of strife, St. Paul avoids them. Yet a name must have been necessary. He called the recipients of his later letters *ἀγίοι*. When he wrote to the Thessalonians and to the Galatians he had not adopted that title and addressed himself to the *ἐκκλησία* of Thessalonica and to the *ἐκκλησίαι* of Galatia. In writing to the Corinthians he uses both expressions.

Οἱ ἀγίοι was, in all probability, a definite title, a proper name. In adopting it St. Paul was influenced by its original meaning, which was separation, set-apartness for God. The Christians were set-apart people. Their life, their worship, and their doctrine distinguished them from both Jew and Gentile. But more than all they were set apart by the *πνεῦμα* which possessed them.

I.

"Possession" was a common religious phenomenon. What was new about this Christian spirit was that it was not confined to individuals; the whole community was possessed. St. Paul, no less than St. Luke, probably recognised in this the fulfilment of Is. lix, 21, and Joel ii, 28-30. We may reasonably ascribe to St. Paul the popularisation of the word *πνεῦμα* as the explanation and name of the phenomenon.

A short review of *The Spirit in the Jewish Scriptures* must be made in order that we may first understand the point from which St. Paul started. It must be remembered that the language of the Jews is concrete, material, realistic. They did not make a contrast, as we do, between spirit and matter. Spirit was itself a substance, a fluid, as it were, that could be poured out.

When God's spirit was given to men they acquired new powers—ecstatic and prophetic powers in the earlier sections of the O.T. (Num. xi, 17, 25, xxiv, 2; I Sam. xi, 6; II Kings ii, 15; Hos. ix, 7).

In the later sections the spirit controls man's activities (Is. xlii, 1; Zech. iv, 6; II Sam. xxiii, 2) and even the whole nation's (Ez. xxxvii, 1-14). It gives men physical and practical powers (Ex. xxviii, 3, xxxi, 3; Is. xi, 2; Neh. ix, 20). This is more than the enhancement of natural powers. The craftsmen of Exodus were thought of as being "possessed" just as surely as were the sons of the prophets.

In the extra-canonical writings the term "Holy Spirit" is used more frequently, probably to indicate the ethical character and to distinguish it from the crowds of spirits that fill the air" (*Encyc. of Religion and Ethics, Art, Holy Spirit*). The book of Wisdom is of little importance for our purpose, because spirit is practically identified with wisdom. "Holy Spirit" occurs fairly frequently in the Talmudic literature, where "holy" distinguishes it from ordinary or evil spirits. It is possible that the term was in common use in Jewish circles in St. Paul's time, though the writings themselves are of a later date.

The examples cited are all connected with abnormalities of behaviour, and probably a strain of animism lies behind the language. Such phrases as the spirit of a deep sleep, Is. xxix, 10, or of perverseness, xix, 14, are due to the same diagnosis of abnormal behaviour as are the explanations of prophecy and Saul's fits. Partial hypostatisation, as in I Sam. xvi, 14-23, is due partly to the old animistic ways of thinking and partly

to a new philosophy, an attempt to solve the problem of evil which culminated in the personification of Satan. The personification of the lesser spirits was much vaguer in thought than in language, while the element of materialism which is characteristic of Jewish thought prevented the personification of the spirit of God.

There was a strong tendency in later Jewish thought to emphasise the transcendence of God. Because he was recognized as holy, direct intercourse with mankind, unholy and impure, was considered to contaminate him; accordingly, the notion of mediators and go-betweens such as angels grew up. The spirit of God sometimes served the same purpose. The three examples in the O.T. of the phrase "holy spirit" occur in this connexion—Ps. li, 11, and Is. lxiii, 10, 11. In Ps. li, holy spirit is balanced by presence in the first half of the verse, as is spirit in Ps. cxxxix, 7. God's spirit and his presence are identical. This is also the case in Is. lxiii. The angel of his presence (verse 9) is a parallel to holy spirit (vv. 10 and 11). There is no hypostatisation in the words, "They grieved his holy spirit." An identical circumlocution is found in liv, 6, "a wife grieved in spirit."

According to E.R.E. "the hypostatisation of the spirit advances in the extra-canonical period to full personality." I am inclined to doubt this statement, for of the two texts which the author adduces in support of his statement, Judith xvi, 10, seems to me valueless. (I have no access to the other—Sibyl: iii, 701). If one supposes that the writer of Judith meant to personify "thy spirit" one must suppose also that he meant to personify "thy voice."

It is clear that the examples in the last two paragraphs belong to an entirely different category from the others. They spring from reverence and a desire to safeguard the holiness of God. We may divide the spirit in the Jewish scriptures into two categories—one man-ward and the other God-ward, one the spirit given to and influencing man, and the other the spirit that preserves God's sanctity.

II.

St. Paul must have been acquainted with Greek thought; but when writing about a subject for which Jewish thought and language were available, his Jewish training and upbringing would be predominant. For him τὸ πνεῦμα would be, in the man-ward usage, not the giver but the gift—a thing—and, in the God-ward usage, a veil and a mediator between God and man.

Grounded as he was in the scriptures St. Paul saw in all history, both made and in the making, the influence of God. He was active in guiding mankind. Accordingly, no event was incredible; at most it was improbable. Sudden irruptions of God into, and altering, the course of history were not surprising. Sudden manifestations of mental abnormality or super-normality needed no elaborate psychological explanation. St. Paul accounted for them as due to outside influence. Such influence was wielded by unseen forces, πνεύματα, which might be evil or good. The source of the latter was God. Tradition presented him with the word πνεῦμα to describe the Christian phenomenon which was first displayed at Pentecost.

The "given-ness" of the spirit is a feature of the O.T. pneumatology. It is equally prominent in the Pauline epistles. See Rom. v, 5, viii, 15; I Cor. ii. 12, xii, 13; II Cor. i, 22, v, 5; Gal. iii, 2, v, 10, iv, 6; Eph. i, 17; Phil. i, 19; I Thess. iv, 8.

Besides the two O.T. categories, τὸ πνεῦμα in St. Paul's epistles falls into a third, the "psychological." Man was composed, according to his generation, of πνεῦμα and σὰρξ, spirit and flesh. πνεῦμα signified the rational, non-animal, and religious part of man's personality, the Jekyll to the Hyde of the σὰρξ, his sensual, animal, earthy part. This may be oversimplified from the point of view of modern psychology. But from the point of view of religious experience it provides an adequate explanation of the conflict with which everyone is familiar in his own life. Non-Christians lived on the fleshly

plane, ἐν σαρκί, and it was the duty of Christians to live ἐν πνεύματι, on the spiritual plane (Gal. v, 25; Rom. viii, 4).

Presumably St. Paul had tried before his conversion to live ἐν πνεύματι, but he had found it a dull and wearisome business. As a Christian he found a sense of buoyancy and freedom, ὥστε δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος καὶ οὐ παλαιότητι γράμματος (Rom. vii, 6). Note, too, how he links ξωή with πνεῦμα (Rom. viii, 1, 10; I Cor. xv, 45). He was composed of πνεῦμα and σὰρξ before his conversion, but the former had never been warmed, so to speak, by the breath of God. His had been a ministry of the old covenant; now he was a minister of the new, οὐ γράμματος ἀλλὰ πνεύματος (II Cor. iii, 6). And the new was not engraved on stone (v, 7); it was διακονία τοῦ πνεύματος.

St. Paul occasionally contrasts πνεῦμα and σὰρξ in a purely psychological manner, e.g., I Cor. v, 3-5, vii, 34; II Cor. vii, 1. Usually, however, πνεῦμα signifies not merely the non-animal part of man's nature, but that part touched and warmed by the breath of God's spirit. There are in St. Paul's Christian psychology not two but three planes of living—the fleshly plane, the non-fleshly, spiritual plane, and the inspired, holy-spiritual plane. This last, I believe, he sometimes describes with the words ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ (II Cor. vi, 6; Rom. xiv, 17, xv, 16).

The difference between this and the man-ward or "given" usage of πνεῦμα is this: that on the one hand Christians possess, and on the other hand they are possessed by, the spirit; on the one hand their powers are enhanced, on the other hand powers are added to them. The two usages are quite clear at first, but gradually they are assimilated. It is just possible in the later epistles to distinguish the two themes, but no useful purpose is served by doing so. Rom. viii, 9, shews how intimately connected they become, Ὑμεῖς οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ἀλλὰ ἐν πνεύματι εἵπερ (if, as is the case) πνεῦμα θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν.

It is noticeable that in none of his letters does St. Paul write as though there were a lack of πνεῦμα, except, perhaps,

in Rom. i, 11. He can take it for granted that his readers know what he means by the word. He had clearly given to *πνεῦμα* a prominent place in his preaching. He had promised his converts that they would receive it (Gal. iii, 14; Eph. i, 13, 14). He expected, so to say, abnormal powers to be part of the normal equipment of a Christian (Rom. viii, 9).

Τὸ πνεῦμα refers to something that was a distinctive mark of Christians. The possession of the spirit was the *ἄρραβὼν*, the earnest and the seal of Christians (II Cor. i, 22, v, 5; Eph. i, 13, 14, iv, 30). It proved to them that God had accepted them, it was an earnest of closer contact with God, and it was the sign that they were marked off from the rest of the world as a chosen people, *ἁγίοι*.

III.

There must have been some outward sign of possession of the spirit. The account in Acts ii of the coming of the spirit shews that the most pronounced feature then was ecstatic utterance. Such, too, seems to have been the case with St. Paul's converts at the beginning of his ministry.

This is a convenient point at which to state my belief that the epistle to the Galatians is the earliest of the Pauline writings. There are many forcible reasons for this opinion and they are supported by a study of St. Paul's pneumatology. In this epistle his ideas are more fluid than in the others. It is, no doubt, precarious to try to confine St. Paul's thought, the product of an eager, impatient mind, within the limits of logical and orderly growth. Yet some attempt must be made to trace the development of his doctrine lest the theology of a later date be read into his words. The first requisite is to place the epistles in their chronological order. We deal with Galatians first.

St. Paul asks (Gal. iii, 2): Did you receive *τὸ πνεῦμα* from works of the law or from the hearing of faith? He can have asked so vague a question only if (a) the phenomena were so

abundant, so well-known, and so striking that no one could doubt to what he referred, and (b) he were certain that they were all derived from God. His indefiniteness suggests that ecstatic utterance was common in Galatia. With this in mind we can interpret iv, 6, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν κραῖζον Ἀββὰ. Κραῖζον is a word that might well be used of ecstatic utterance. Just as Jesus was accustomed to calling God Ἀββὰ, so it is his spirit that makes us cry out in ecstasy Ἀββὰ. This, moreover, is a proof of our sonship.

In chapter v we have what I may term the "enhancement motif." The works of the flesh are such and such; the fruit of the spirit is love, etc. The contrast between πνεῦμα and σὰρξ makes it clear that St. Paul's usage of πνεῦμα is psychological. At this date he writes as though unaware that he is using one word in two different senses, of the spirit displayed in ecstasy and of the spiritual life. In later epistles he writes almost entirely of the "given" spirit, whose fruit is now ethical, the emphasis on its outward signs having passed from what is temporarily striking to what is permanently valuable, from the mere possession of the spirit to its fruits. In consequence St. Paul allows the "enhancement motif" to fade, for it adds nothing to the "given" theme.

The epistles to the Thessalonians are undoubtedly early. It is, therefore, remarkable that three times out of its five occurrences—one of which we may ignore—πνεῦμα is accompanied by ἅγιον. It is easy and tempting to say that here we have the Holy Spirit. To do so, however, raises an unanswerable question, "Why does St. Paul's doctrine of the Holy Spirit and of the Trinity suffer from arrested development or even retrogression in his later epistles?"

It is noteworthy that St. Paul does not address the Thessalonians as ἅγιοι. But they could not but be set apart. πνεῦμα ἅγιον I Thess. i, 5, 6, in both verses unaccompanied by the article, is the given spirit. The Thessalonians received the message not only in word, but also with δυνάμεις, wonders

and ecstatic utterance. The reception of the message was also not unattended by tribulation; but this was countered by *χαρὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου*, joy resulting from the new powers they possessed, a "holy-spiritual" joy which off-set the troubles of the flesh.

"*Ἁγίου*" distinguishes the *πνεῦμα* as specifically Christian and setting-apart and also serves to repel attacks; some there were who accused the Christians of being possessed by an evil spirit, just as the Christians charged the girl who pestered them at Philippi (Acts xvi, 16-18) with being possessed by an evil spirit.

iv, 8. An appeal for sexual purity, supported by a reminder of the new spirit which God had given them—a spirit which coming from God is clearly pure. The appeal is based not on the purity of the spirit so much as on the fact that it comes from God. Cf. I Cor. iii, 16, vi, 11. We have the same emphasis on purity in II Thess. ii, 13.

v, 19. In conjunction with *προφητεία*, *πνεῦμα* means ecstatic utterance, as it does also in II Thess. ii, 2.

The spirit, in these two epistles, is something given to Christians (and to no one else) and given by God. It is his spirit and is consequently pure and holy. It is not, however, to the purity of the spirit that St. Paul appeals. It is simply the possession of the spirit that is important, an importance that is due to its source.

Perhaps it was his experience of affairs at Corinth that made him transfer the emphasis in his doctrine of the spirit from its possession to its fruits. The Corinthians seem to have been the least satisfactory of his converts. He had to rebuke them for their quarrelsomeness, their jealousies, their immorality, and their disorderly worship. If he had been inclined to regard the spectacular signs of possession by *πνεῦμα* as evidence of flourishing life in a Christian community he had to revise his opinions. The Corinthians were filled with the spirit and yet all was not well.

From the first, ecstatic utterance had been known to the Corinthians, for St. Paul himself had been endowed with it, I Cor. ii, 4, xiv, 18. It was a prominent feature of the community. The key-word, so to speak, for the interpretation of ii, 10-14, is ecstatic utterance. "To us God revealed through ecstatic utterance even the deep things of God, for ecstatic utterance searches all things." Again, v, 12, Who knows the thoughts of a man except with the spirit of a man? So no one comprehends the thoughts of God save with τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ, ecstatic utterance. The man in the street, v, 14, ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος, fails to understand ecstatic utterance.

Then an episode occurred which threw doubts on ecstatic utterance. It appears that someone in ecstasy had been heard to say Ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς xii, 3. That man cannot, St. Paul says, have been inspired by God. The message of the ecstasy is a test of its validity; from which it follows that a man who calls out Κύριος Ἰησοῦς is obviously possessed by πνεῦμα ἅγιον. ἅγιον is added to show that he means the good spirit. πνεῦμα θεοῦ, its equivalent, is also in antithesis to the evil spirit which cries Ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς.

A further anxiety about ecstasy is allayed in chapter xiv, in which St. Paul tries so to regulate it that it may be used for edification in public worship.

Chapter xii, 4ff, reflects his uneasiness at the state of affairs and, perhaps, shews him altering his point of emphasis. There may have been some strife as to which of the signs of τὸ πνεῦμα was most important; some, perhaps, maintained that there was but one sign of τὸ πνεῦμα—namely, ecstatic utterance; others, it may be, asserted that there were many πνεύματα, as many as there were signs. The disputes are not of consequence except in that they called forth St. Paul's insistence that there is only one πνεῦμα, but that there are many signs of it. Just as there are many ways of serving and only one master, just as there are many works and only one worker, God, behind them all, so there are many signs of inspiration and only one spirit.

The list of vv. 8-10 is very different from that in Gal. v, 22. This, however, is not surprising, for the circumstances in which the two were written were utterly different. In Galatians St. Paul was giving a list of ideal Christian virtues, based on a theory of the spirit which, as I believe, he abandoned; in Corinthians he was dealing with an actual state of affairs, cataloguing powers which had in fact appeared.

Purity is not mentioned in this list, which is concerned with mental and moral abilities. Elsewhere St. Paul is emphatic that because of the source of the spirit that has been given them purity ought to be a distinguishing feature of Christians, iii, 16, 17, vi, 11, 19. It is probable that ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ in II Cor. vi, 6, coming as it does in a list of moral virtues, refers to purity, holy-spirituality.

II Cor. i, 22, iii, 3, 6, 8, v, 5, testify to the prominence of conversion of πνεῦμα, and xi, 4, to the readiness of the Corinthians to welcome ecstatic signs indiscriminately.

The Greek of iii, 17, 18, is uncertain, and it is not safe to base any argument on the striking words ὁ δὲ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν. It may be that St. Paul means, "The Lord, in the last verse, means the spirit." In general these verses continue the argument of the rest of the chapter—that conversion is marked by a sense of buoyancy and freedom unknown to followers of the Law.

The "Grace" of II Cor. xiii, 13, mentions a new outward sign of τὸ πνεῦμα. The grace which comes from our Lord Jesus Christ and the love which comes from God and the fellowship which comes from the holy spirit. This is not yet Trinitarian doctrine. If St. Paul means the third person in the holy Trinity he has given us no hint as to why he couples the word κοινωνία with him. If, on the other hand, he refers to the spirit which is common to all Christians κοινωνία is the *mot juste*, for fellowship was the natural mark of men who shared, and were set apart by sharing, πνεῦμα; and it forms a link between the many and diverse signs of πνεῦμα,

The most striking passage in the epistle to the Romans is

chapter viii, verses 9 to 11. These verses raise three insistent questions, What is the relation between *πνεῦμα Θεοῦ*, *πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ*, and *Χριστός*? Why are verses 9b and 10 inserted at this point? What is the significance of their emphasis upon the need of the spirit of Christ?

The word *αὐτοῦ* towards the end of verse 11 is the key to these puzzles. It refers to *Χριστόν Ἰησοῦν* a few words back. The indwelling spirit is Christ's.

St. Paul's favourite argument in support of the resurrection is that Christ's resurrection is a proof of the resurrection of his followers, that he is *ἀπαρχή*, I Cor. xv, 20, 23; that because God raised Jesus we can rely upon his raising us from the dead, I Cor. vi, 14, II Cor. iv, 14, Phil. iii, 21, I Thess. iv, 14. In this passage from Romans we have the most emphatic of all the statements of the argument: because he raised Christ God is, as it were, under compulsion to raise you if you have the spirit of Christ in you.

The question of the relevance of 9b and 10 is answered and, incidentally, a solution of a textual problem offers itself. The interpretation I have suggested requires the accusative, *τὸ ἐνοικοῦν αὐτοῦ πνεῦμα*, which B, D, and other authorities read. Grammatically, *αὐτοῦ* ought to refer not to Christ but to God. B, D, etc., understood St. Paul's ungrammatical construction and preserved the accusative which he wrote, whereas the other texts, assuming that *αὐτοῦ* referred to God, altered the accusative into the genitive in order to make easier sense of the passage.

It is clear that *πνεῦμα θεοῦ* is quite distinct from *πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ*. It is, moreover, different from *θεός*. The care with which St. Paul avoids equating the two is very marked. *πνεῦμα θεοῦ* is a gift, distinct from the Giver. On the other hand, *πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ* and *Χριστός* are almost identical. As in Phil. i, 19, *πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ* is nearly the equivalent of the presence of Christ. The sphere of action of *πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ* is different from that of *πνεῦμα θεοῦ*. The former gives such life to the spirit of man that his body is no more trouble than

a corpse, v. 10; the latter revives the whole person at the resurrection, v. 11. The former is a matter of present religious experience; the latter an outside force taking possession, the individual being a mere puppet. Both can dwell in a man simultaneously. *πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ* almost eliminates and takes the place of the human spirit. *πνεῦμα θεοῦ* can possess and control him in whom dwells the spirit of Christ, v. 11.

Since St. Paul was writing his epistle to the Romans to strangers his language about *τὸ πνεῦμα* is evidence only of his beliefs and not of the state of affairs in Rome. We cannot be certain that ecstatic utterance was there known, but viii, 26, 27, shews that it was still a feature of St. Paul's devotional life. *τὸ πνεῦμα* is clearly ecstatic utterance. We do not know how to pray as we ought, but "tongues" come to our aid with groans unspeakable (exactly what St. Paul mentions and regulates for in I Cor. xiv) and he who searches the heart knows the meaning of the "tongues." The predominant marks of the given spirit are, however, ethical. The spirit bears fruits of purity, xv, 16, of love towards man, xv, 30, and towards God, v, 5, of peace and joy, xiv, 17, of a son-and not a slave-mentality, viii, 15, of spirituality, viii, 9.

Ecstatic utterance was still a feature of a Christian community when he wrote to the Ephesians. The contrast between *μὴ μεθύσκεσθε* and *πληροῦσθε ἐν πνεύματι*, v, 18, shews this, a contrast which reminds us of the hostile criticisms on the first Whitsunday. Some such outward sign is implied also in i, 13. Wisdom i, 17, fellowship, ii, 18, union with Christ, iii, 16, 17, and unity, iv, 3, are also marks of the spirit.

St. Paul reaches out for the first time to the doctrine of the personification of the Spirit in iv, 30, *μὴ λυπεῖτε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τοῦ θεοῦ*. But one cannot say categorically that this is Trinitarian doctrine, for he continues, *ἐν ᾧ ἐσφραγίσθητε*, a phrase which we have met before (II Cor. i, 22, v, 5, Eph. i, 13, 14) where *πνεῦμα* refers not to a person but to a gift. Had St. Paul written, Grieve not the holy spirit we should be certain that he referred to a person distinct from the Father; but why add *τοῦ θεοῦ*?

There are two relevant verses in Philippians, i, 19, and ii, 1. In the former *πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* is almost untranslatable. St. Paul was a mystic and lived in so close a unity with his Master that he writes as though Christ were living again in him; cf. iii, 9, 10. *πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ* is more than the influence of Jesus; it is rather the power of the presence of Jesus. The word *ἐπιχορηγία* suggests that this belongs to the "given" usage of *πνεῦμα*; it is a gift. Compare Gal. v, 10.

ii, 1, *κοινωνία πνεύματος*. In this plea for unity and concord and generosity St. Paul naturally appeals to their common heritage, the spirit. His appeal implies a society every member of which was in some degree and in some manner inspired.

IV.

In interpreting St. Paul's theology it is of the first importance to remember that he belongs to the type known as "twice-born." Like all who experience a sudden conversion he was apt to see everything in terms of Before and After. That it was the same self who persecuted Christ before his conversion as followed him after it seemed incredible; that the change had taken place without outside aid seemed impossible. It is not from the ranks of the twice-born that Pelagians spring. By the grace of God I am what I am, he writes. Only with the help of some power bestowed upon him could he have emerged from the black Before.

It is natural, then, to find that one characteristic of the spirit in the Pauline epistles is its given-ness. The spirit is a gift of God. He writes of it as given, or received, or dwelling as a guest. (There is no implication of personality in the word *οἰκέω*; it is used in Rom. vii, 20, of *ἀμαρτία*.) This given-ness is the first fact that emerges from our study.

The second is that the gift was confined to Christians. Only to members of the body, the Church, was the spirit given. Thirdly, all Christians possessed—or were expected to possess—the gift.

Fourthly, it is clear that *πνεῦμα* has so many connotations that it is impossible to find one English word that will adequately translate it. Sometimes St. Paul's use is psychological, sometimes theological. Within the theological category there is a sub-division, for he uses it of both cause and effect: he appeals to the possession of the spirit in support of his insistence on the need of purity, spirituality, and other ethical virtues (I Thess. i, 5, 6, I Cor. iii, 16, 17, vi, 11, 19) and he makes the same appeal when demanding loyalty to his teaching (Gal. iii). One appeal is based on the source, and the other on the signs, of the spirit. He uses *πνεῦμα*, too, both of ecstatic utterance and also of moral virtues.

A fifth point to notice is the uncertainty about the personality of the spirit. We do not suppose that St. Paul personified *ἀγαπή*, and yet in I Cor. xiii he writes of it as more personal and more active than ever he writes of *πνεῦμα*. Out of the 120 occasions in which he uses *πνεῦμα* only 10 times is it the subject of a verb. Nine of these do not necessarily indicate personification. One is II Cor. iii, 6, where *πνεῦμα*, in contrast with *γράμμα*, means the reverse of formalism and legalism. Five times the sense demands the translation "ecstatic utterance," Rom. viii, 16, 26, I Cor. ii, 10, 11. Three times with *θεοῦ* and *οἰκεῖ*. The tenth is I Cor. xii, 11. This and Eph. iv, 30, are the most decisive evidence for personification that we have. But the cloud of uncertainty remains when we compare I Cor. xii, 11, with, e.g., xiii, 4-7, and when we recognise in Eph. iv, 30, an echo of Is. lxiii, 10.

It is important to make an attempt to comprehend what St. Paul himself meant and to avoid reading into his words what the Gospels, e.g., dispose one to think he meant. An example of this sort of prejudgement may be illuminating. The S.P.C.K. *Commentary on the New Testament*, page 415, and Gore, *Belief in Christ*, page 238, seize upon the distinctness of the spirit from God as evidence of the personality of the spirit. But the distinctness proves nothing more than that there is a distinction. It has no bearing whatsoever upon the question of personality. It is irrelevant unless one assumes what is to be

proved—the personality. Before a distinctness is of significance some very close similarity must be proved. The spirit in the Pauline epistles is divine, for it is God's. But St. Paul did not think of it as a person.

Finally, I would point out that it is a mistake to suppose the results of this essay to be wholly negative. One may write with truth that it is doubtful whether we should find any hint of the dogma of the personality of the Spirit in the Pauline epistles. But more remains to be said. For, on the other hand, there is nothing in St. Paul's words to suggest that the Trinitarian doctrine of St. John, had he known it, would be unacceptable or alien to him. The fact that St. Paul did not enunciate the doctrine of the Holy Trinity is no proof that St. John had no right to. Indeed, one might almost say that St. Paul would have welcomed the Johannine theology, as clarifying his own urgent and often turgid arguments, bringing them into focus, and sharpening their perspective.

One may write with truth that St. Paul was not a Trinitarian. But again there is more to be said. We do not depend for our theology on any one writer in the New Testament. Nor, even if we do choose St. Paul as our mentor and ignore the other writers, can we suppose that what he says is the last word on the matter. For his writings shew him to have been a man who never stopped learning, and his doctrines at the end of his life are still in process of development. The fact that the church jumped to the conclusion that St. Paul believed the doctrine of the Trinity as firmly as did, e.g., St. John, is evidence of a lack of the critical sense. But it is evidence also of the rightness of her intuition. The undeveloped pneumatology of St. Paul and the maturer doctrine of the other writers combine to form a balanced and harmonious unity. We are not getting nearer the truth by retaining only what is primitive in any doctrine and by setting aside further developments; we are receding from it. We are in danger of taking a partial presentation of the truth to be the whole.

ART. VI.—EXTERNALS OF CHURCH WORSHIP AND
CHURCH GOVERNMENT IN SCOTLAND UNDER
CHARLES II.

WHEN Charles II reintroduced Episcopacy into Scotland there was doubtless in his mind the expectation of general uniformity in religion throughout his dominions. Several bishops were consecrated for Scotland according to the form and practice of the Church of England. Robert Blair complains of the pontificals, lawn sleeves, rochets, surplices and tippets, and mentions the Book of Ordination and the Service Book. Some who were thus promoted were eager to please the king and ambitious to be equal with any English bishop, but one may not generalise too freely regarding their attitude, for they differed among themselves. Sharp's domineering at St. Andrews contrasts somewhat with the persuasive manner of Leighton at Dunblane, and Scougall at Aberdeen could lead his willing clergy, whereas in Glasgow and Galloway driving was required. As the period advanced also there were slight changes. On the one hand people grew accustomed to the new ways and could in some places be urged farther along them. On the other hand, irritation in strongly Covenanting districts greatly increased, and this had its inevitable effect upon general policy.

Two-thirds of the formerly Presbyterian ministers of Scotland became Episcopalian clergy by command of the king. These had for the most part belonged to the Resolutioner party who had been growing more and more sick of the tyrannical narrowness of the Protesters and were only too ready to break away from the conditions in which they had been living under the Commonwealth. They embraced the formal change eagerly enough, but we must not forget that they had been brought up in completely Presbyterian habits and they naturally (for the great part no doubt unconsciously) continued

the practices to which they had been accustomed, in so far as these were allowed. Their congregations made still less change in their religious life. Even the new generation that grew up to enter the ministry went under the supervision of such men as John Menzeis at Aberdeen, who had been for a time an Independent and whose chief interest had always been, and continued to be, the struggle against Popery and Arminianism—or William Douglas, also a professor at Aberdeen, who had at one time been called “a great Covenanter,” who was opposed to any but the simplest ritual, and remained a stout Calvinist. Others again had come under the influence of Leighton, and did not think that matters of government or ceremonial were of real consequence.

It is not therefore altogether a surprise to discover that little difference can be found between the externals of government and of worship in the reign of Charles II and those of the preceding Presbyterian period. Let us take the question of church government first, and note the changes, and then the resemblances.

The main difference was certainly the relation to the State authority. The bishops were the king's nominees, and the synods and other courts met by authority of the bishops, and therefore not as free ecclesiastical courts. The king had begun by interposing his royal authority to restore the bishops, and an Act of Parliament confirmed his action. The subordinate courts were first forbidden and then allowed by the Privy Council. This Erastianism was a complete reversal of the Theocratic Protectorate of the preceding years, and many even among the Episcopalians disliked the royal supremacy in spiritual matters, while the stricter Presbyterians believed Episcopacy a mere human device as contrasted with a divine ordinance, and Gilbert Burnet found the Covenanters keenly concerned about the powers of princes in matters of religion. The bishops were naturally much occupied with duties that were political, legal, parliamentary, but this was nothing new to those who had lived through the preceding period, when

both in and out of their pulpits ministers could scarcely discriminate between church and state.

The National Synod which was planned to take the place of the old General Assembly never met, so that what Knox had regarded as the keystone of Scottish Church government was wanting. The courts which did continue were under permanent moderators, the synods under the bishop himself, and the presbyteries under his nominees, appointed sometimes as at Dunblane "with the consent of the brethren." They were thus less free and democratic. Leighton, however, was careful to proclaim that every member of his synod had absolute freedom of discussion and voting. Burnet, on the other hand, regarded the synod as merely the voice of the bishop. Probably he was thinking of Glasgow and St. Andrews.

Laymen were now excluded from synods and presbyteries, whereas their presence had latterly been regarded as highly important, though they do not seem to have borne any great share in the work of the courts. Under Episcopacy lay influence was still available through Parliament and in Kirk Sessions. In one or two instances one finds a tendency to avoid such a word as presbytery, and to speak rather of the exercise, using Knox's word, or the "meeting of the ministers of the respective bounds for exercise of their gifts." At Airlie we even notice an attempt to avoid the word "elder," for a minute of November, 1662, speaks instead of "assistants for discipline in ye sessions"; but apart from a few solitary cases there was no attempt at change. Blair hints that the bishops would like to have done away with the subordinate courts, but if this was ever dreamt of the thought was at once abandoned and we find every endeavour being made to maintain the courts at full strength, ministers being sternly required to be present, and even unwilling men forced to take up the work of the eldership.

Turning to the resemblances between conditions before and after the restoration of Episcopacy, we notice that very quickly the church courts were at work on the old lines. In some records it is impossible to trace any alteration whatever

in practice. Ministers who had been ordained in Presbyterian times were not re-ordained when they sought collation from the bishops and were confirmed in their parishes. There was, it is true, the case of Robinson, an Edinburgh minister who insisted upon re-ordination, but he was the exception. New ministers, though now presented by patrons, had to be duly qualified by university training and were examined by the Presbytery in exactly the same manner and subjects as formerly. The account given by an Episcopalian at the close of the period might have been written any time in the previous half-century in either Episcopalian or Presbyterian eras. "No man was ever admitted to the ministry till he had first pass'd his course at some University and commenc'd Master of Arts; and generally none are admitted to tryal for being probationers till, after that commencement, they have been four or five years students in Divinity. The method of that tryal is commonly this. The candidate gets first a text prescrib'd him, on which he makes a homily before some Presbytery; then he has an exegesis in Latin on some Common Head (ordinarily some Popish controversie) and sustains disputes upon it; after this he is tryed as to his skill in the languages and chronology; he is likewise obliged to answer (extempore) any question in Divinity that shall be proposed to him by any member of the Presbytery. This is called the Questionary Tryal; then he has that which we call the Exercise and Addition, that is (as it is in most Presbyteries) one day he must analise and comment upon a text for half-an-hour or so to shew his skill in textual, critical and casuistick theology, and another day for another half-hour he discourses again by drawing practical inferences etc., to shew his abilities that way too; and then lastly he must make a popular sermon." Those who passed this test were licensed to preach and in a few years might be selected for a parish whereupon they would be re-examined by the Presbytery and then recommended to the bishop, who would ordain by the laying-on of hands, after which the moderator and brethren of the Presbytery would admit him to his charge, giving him (as the Presbytery records of Inverness tell us was "usual in

such cases") a Bible, the Book of Discipline, and the key of the church door, after which he received the right hand of fellowship from the Presbytery and from the congregation. We gather that ordination by the bishop was at least sometimes according to the forms of the Church of England. So Blair says, and we hear that Archbishop Burnet of Glasgow "ordained 5 or 6 curats by the form of the English pontifical, designing them priests and making them kiss the Bible." The minister's duties differed in no respect from those recognised in the earlier period, preaching retaining its central position, the minister indeed for long not even entering the church until this part of the service was approaching.

As far as theological beliefs were concerned, there was likewise no change. Most of the academic teachers were true disciples of Dort and Westminster, and their pupils followed them unquestioningly. An Episcopalian pamphlet of 1690 says: "Any moderate man will certainly think the difference between our Scots Episcopacy and Presbytery not worth the heat or danger of a dispute, for first as to the doctrine, both parties are agreed, the Confession of Faith made by Mr. Knox and ratified in Parliament by King James VI and revived again in the Test Act by King Charles II, this, together with the Westminster Confession (both agreed on by the General Assembly of Presbyters) are owned next to the Word of God by both parties as the standard of the doctrine of our Church." At Inverness in 1670 we have the Presbytery enquiring into the theological reading of a student and satisfied when he enumerates Calvin's *Institutes*, Pareus on the Catechism of Ursinus, Willet's *General View of Papistry*, and the *Cursus Theologicus* of John Sharpe, etc. No list could better have satisfied a Scottish Presbytery in 1650. At Inverness also in this episcopal period we hear of the conversion of a Romanist who in evidence of his true faith was obliged to subscribe the Westminster Confession.

There are indeed cases of alleged Arminianism, a form of doctrine commonly associated with Anglicanism in the Scottish mind; but when one analyses the charges one discovers that

most of them—though not all—were based merely upon a slackening of the strictness of Calvinism as understood by the Protesters, and in some cases, as with Leighton and his school, upon the presence of a kind of mysticism which was rather indifferent to dogma. Episcopalian writers at the time of the Revolution showed themselves eager to disclaim Arminianism. And it is to be noted that one sees no reduction in this whole period of that fierce antipathy to Romanism which had characterised the Scottish Reformation.

The Kirk Session, which consisted of ministers, elders and deacons, and was charged with discipline in the parish, and with the care of the poor, continued to function as formerly. One of the first acts of the newly-constituted synod of St. Andrews was to declare "how necessary it is that ministers be assisted in exercise of discipline" and to instruct them to select elders. This appointment of elders by the minister was a natural beginning, but after that the former method of appointment by the Session (with due notice to the congregation in order to receive possible objections) was as naturally resumed. Appointment was for one year only, though re-election was common. In Covenanted districts—for example at Kirkcowan in Galloway, and at Kilmacolm in Renfrewshire—there was difficulty in finding the requisite number of Episcopalian elders, and disciplinary measures had to be taken by Presbyteries to make men act. The method of admission may be gathered from the interesting account of an election of deacons at Alyth in 1677: "Those deacons formerly lited . . . were this day elected and chosen to the charge of deaconship, and being desired to compeir before the Session were called and compeired personally every one of them, and were content to embrace the said charge, and the minister enquiring and asking the Session particularly if they knew anything against these persons why they may not be admitted to be members of the Session, all answered negatively, and so the minister having holden out ther duties in discharging ther office they promised faithfulness therin according to ther pour with uplifted hands." There was, of course, no ordination by laying-on of hands.

The discipline cases before the Session were of the same types in all periods of the century, and the treatment meted out to the offenders was likewise precisely on the same lines. A contemporary pamphlet states: "As to the discipline, its exactly in our Episcopal Church (if it may be so called) according to the model of the Presbyterian mother kirk at Geneva." At South Leith in 1668 we find the elders visiting their districts the first Monday of every month and reporting to the Session; and the Presbytery at its usual Visitation recorded "that the ministers and session were carefull to see all manner of vice borne downe and punished, had specialie care to see the Lord's day strictlie observed . . . suffered no strangers to reside within the bounds without sufficient testimonialls produced from the paroches they cam last frome, very carefull to see the rentes belonging to the Church uplifted and employed to pyous and charitable uses."

It is interesting to discover what strict views prevailed regarding the keeping of the sabbath. The Session at Alyth in 1675 took to task those who opened their shops on Sunday and forbad them to sell "except neidfull tobacco and bread." At Ceres in 1686 "the elders who gathers the collectione evrie Sabbath are appoynted to goe and search ye alehouses efter the third bell both in ye fore and efternoon yt yr be no abuse comitted wpon the Sabbath day. As also yt nön be seen wpon the street sitting and clashing." At Peebles a man was punished for killing a fish with a stone thrown from a bridge on the sabbath and going into the water for it. In the Presbytery of Alford we have a case of "profanation of the Lord's day by wronging his neighbour in killing his dogg."

The harshness of the punishment was as great in this period as in any. At Peebles in 1666 "brethren report that Elizabeth Melrose has stood in the habit of an adulteress for twelve months and they knew of no reason why she should not be received. She compeared in sackcloth and confessing her sin with tears was appointed to be received." In 1672 at the same place a woman is "ordained to stand in the jouns,"

and another to be "scourged out of the town next market day." A common entry is such as we find at Dingwall in 1663—"to stand two Lord's dayes *in sacco* and to mak profession of her repentance": or at Ceres in 1667 "appeared upon the pillar and was spoken to *pro primo*." A subtle distinction is evident at Galston in 1676, where two sinners appeared on the stool of repentance, "one with the sackcloth-gown and the other with the sheets." The psychology is perhaps better where, as at Inverness in 1681, a paternity charge is settled by the man being ordered to take his oath before the congregation "with one hand upon the child's head and the other hand upon the Bible." The Sessions had the active concurrence of the magistrates in their disciplinary work.

The Presbytery (apart from the absence of representative lay-elders) was the same court under Charles II which the Commonwealth had known, with the same opening "exercises and additions," the same frank "censures" of these discourses, the same examination of candidates for licence and ordination, the same investigation of troublesome discipline appeals, the same regular "privy censures" of the members of the court, the same visitations of parishes with the same points of enquiry. Many Presbytery records covering this period are extant and a few—e.g., those of the "Exercise" of Alford—have been printed. The Synods likewise performed work of the type for which they were designed by the early Presbyterians, and the minutes of their meetings—e.g., those of Dunkeld and Dunblane—are amongst the most valuable documents for the illustration of the religious life of the period.

It is important to realise that these three courts, so characteristic of Presbyterianism, were thus continued in practically all their former functions, the result being perhaps as satisfactory a working instrument as compromise could have devised. It has, however, to be remembered that as to large matters of policy the real power was in the hands of the prelates as agents of the king's will, and the strict Covenanters in detestation of Erastianism would not even be tempted by Leighton's

Accommodation, while to the Episcopalians it seemed full of needless concessions and fatal to the existing system of control.

Perhaps more remarkable is the continuity that was maintained from the earlier Presbyterian times in the matter of worship. Certain changes did take place, and these should first be mentioned. The Westminster Directory was explicitly laid aside, and Knox's Book of Common Order became once more the only recognised guide to worship. The Aberdeen Synod records are clear on both these points. The system of Lecturing (that is expounding a chapter in addition to preaching a sermon), a practice which had lately become customary among the Presbyterians, was abolished, and readers were again introduced to conduct a short service before the minister appeared, including chapters of scripture, a set form of prayer (after Knox) with the Lord's Prayer, the Creed and the Ten Commandments. The Doxology at the close of the Psalms was restored to the place it had had in Scottish practice until English Independent and Puritan influences had banished it. It ought perhaps to be emphasised that these had been accepted customs in Presbyterian Scotland. Gilbert Burnet has called attention to this in his *Vindication*. He writes: "When some designers for popularity in the western parts of that Kirk did begin to disuse the Lord's Prayer in Worship, and the singing the conclusion or doxology after the Psalm, and the minister's kneeling for private devotion when he entered the pulpit, the General Assembly took this in very ill part, and in a letter they wrote to the Presbyteries complained sadly, "of a spirit of innovation was beginning to get into the Kirk and to throw these laudible practices out of it, mentioning the three I named, which are commanded to be still practised, and such as refused obedience are appointed to be conferr'd with in order to the giving of them satisfaction, and if they continu'd untractable, the Presbyteries were to proceed against them as they should be answerable to the next general assembly." So says Burnet, and we know that the three customs mentioned were definitely regarded as at the very worst "nocent ceremonies" till English influences came in. In towns—e.g., Dunblane and Ellon—we

hear of public prayers morning and evening. Even these were not from the English Prayer Book. We have those devised by Henry Scougall for use in St. Machar's Cathedral, Aberdeen. The only use made of the Book of Common Prayer was in family worship, and it was not till 1680 that even this was made permissible by the Privy Council. Sir Walter Scott's accounts of religious services in Scotland in this period are notoriously erroneous. It was in the early eighteenth century that Scottish Episcopacy began to take on its present guise.

The changes proposed in worship seem to have been concerted by the bishops before the first synods met in October, 1662. The minute of the Privy Council for September 10th shows them to have been busy in Parliament and to be now setting out for their dioceses to order affairs there according to the new ways, and the existing synod records show that the very same instructions were issued through them all. Later records show us what the actual practice must have been. The Synod of St. Andrews in April, 1666, decreed that "Moderators are to take notice of the uniformity of ministers in their practise of causing the Creed to be recited at Baptismes and of singing of the Doxologie and of making use of the Lord's Prayer in publick." To facilitate the reading of scripture, the minister of New Machar in 1678 presented to his church "a new large Kirk Bible . . . there being never any Kirk Bible here befor." In 1695 when after considerable difficulty the Presbyterian service was restored in Aberdeen, the Presbytery sent word to Old Machar that the precentor must "from henceforth desist from saying any liturgy, reading, singing the Doxologie, in the Kirk, morning and evening, as befor."

That the new rules were not universally observed is obvious from the repetition of the same instructions from time to time. We find the lecture being forbidden by the Privy Council in 1670 and the Synod of Edinburgh still busy forbidding it in 1683. We find the Bishop of Aberdeen in 1682 recommending the Presbyteries to have the ministers "observant in saying the Lord's Prayer and singing the Doxology" and in using the

Apostles' Creed at baptisms, and a similar order was issued in 1688. In the Synod of Moray the same thing happened. In Glenholm parish in the south of Scotland we hear, in June, 1668, that there "the Lord's Prayer was not said, nor the Doxology sung." At Kilmacolm in 1681 a minister admits that "as yet he has not sung the Doxologie." He is ordered to sing it "on his hazard." Robert Edward's curious *Doxology Approven*, published in 1683, provides further evidence of neglect of this kind. "In one paroch Church you may hear the Doxology Christianly sung, but in the next paroch Church no mention of it": "yea, and too often in the same Church assembly both in city and country when it comes to the closing of the psalm some sing the Doxology decently, others sitting by who did sing the psalm instantly turn silent at the Doxology." The Lord's Prayer and the Doxology had come to be the essential symbols of Episcopacy in Scotland, and it is therefore not surprising to have a record such as that of the Session of Mauchline in 1685, where we read of a man appearing in the public place of repentance for marching out of the church with his hat on while the Doxology was being sung. George Garden, in his preface to the *Works of John Forbes of Corse*, refers to the Presbyterian antipathy to the Lord's Prayer, and we find the same thing in *Presbyterian Eloquence Displayed*, though on the other hand such a writer as John Anderson of Dumbarton attempts later to defend the Presbyterians from the extremeness of this charge.

Not at the beginning of our period, but a little later, we have the Episcopalians being encouraged to observe Easter Communion. Thus the ministers of Fordyce Presbytery reported in April, 1686, that they had celebrated communion on Easter Day conform to act of synod. Aberdeen Synod recommended in 1685 that communion should be "at Easter if they can possiblie doe it." The Synod of Moray had made a recommendation in this direction in October, 1677. But the general practice may be gathered from such reports as the following. In 1677 communion was celebrated in the various parishes of Turriff Presbytery (in each case, as was the practice,

on two successive Sundays) and the dates were, April 1 and 8; April 22 and 29; May 6 and 13; May 20 and 27; end of June; August 5 and 12. In 1674 the parishes of Alford Presbytery had communion as follows: 5 parishes on Easter Sunday, and the others on May 24, June 5, July 22, July 29, and September 6. At Alyth it seems to have been always on some date from May to September. The dates were generally influenced by the fact that all the members of the congregation had to be catechised before the communion and weather interfered rather badly with this in the winter-time. Seed-time and harvest had also to be avoided.

Another observance peculiar to the episcopal period was that of May 29. Experience in this case was not always satisfactory in country districts. In 1672 three ministers of Alford Presbytery reported that they had been in readiness to conduct a service but no one came, while in 1676 the same Presbytery's records bear that the ministers all observed the day "but regrated that they could have but very few to hear them."

No doubt apart from these small points which were raised practically to the position of tests, there would be a slightly different atmosphere which would distinguish the Episcopalian service from the Presbyterian. *Presbyterian Eloquence Displayed* would indicate that indeed there was a world of difference in the atmosphere, but the outward difference was clearly quite amazingly slight. There was no liturgy in use, the prayers being extemporaneous and the order of service not that of the Church of England, but on the lines laid down by John Knox and by the Westminster Directory. Gilbert Burnet tells us "this Church is the only one in the world, which hath no rule for worship." Dr. George Garden states that there was "no general liturgy appointed for the whole Church," and Hart, writing in 1703 in favour of the Episcopalian clergy, says they had conducted their services "without a liturgy or set forms." John Anderson the Presbyterian writes (1714) that "in the late times before the Revolution the Episcopal clergy did not so much as essay to bring in a Liturgie."

There are four specially interesting and authentic accounts of the service in this period, which should be compared with the descriptions given by Brereton (1634) and Alexander Henderson (1641) of the service in earlier times. The matter is so important that I give them all.

The anonymous author of the *Case of the Afflicted Clergy* (1690) says: "As to the Worship, it's exactly the same both in the Church and conventicle. In the Church there are no ceremonies at all enjoined or practised, only some persons more reverent think fit to be uncovered which our Presbyterians do but by halves even in the time of prayer; we have no liturgy or form of prayer, no, not in the Cathedrals, the only difference in this point is, our clergy are not so overbold nor fulsome in their extemporary expressions as the others are, nor use so many vain repetitions, and we generally conclude one of our prayers with that which our Saviour taught and commanded which the other party decry as superstitious and formal. Amen, too, gives great offence, tho neither the clerk nor people use it, only the minister sometimes shuts up his prayer with it. The sacraments are administered after the same way and manner by both, neither so much as kneeling at the prayers, or when they receive the elements of the Lord's Supper, but all sitting together at a long table in the body of the church or chancel."

Sir George Mackenzie, Lord Advocate, in his *Vindication of the Government in Scotland during the Reign of King Charles II* (1691) says: "The reader will be astonished when we inform him that the way of worship in our church differed nothing from what the Presbyterians themselves practised (except only that we used the Doxologie, the Lord's Prayer and in Baptism the Creed, all which they rejected). We had no ceremonies, surplice, altars, cross in Baptisms, nor the meanest of those things which would be allowed in England by the Dissenters in way of accommodation."

Bishop Rattray, looking back upon the same period, writes: "We had no such thing as any offices or liturgies used among us. The method in our ordinary assemblies on the

Lord's Day was almost the same as with that of the Presbyterians: beginning with singing a stanza or two of the metre Psalms, after which followed an extemporary prayer, during which, as well as at singing of the Psalms, most of the congregation sat irreverently on their breech, only they were uncovered. Then came a long sermon, the text of which was no sooner read but most of the people put on their hats or bonnets. After the sermon followed another extemporary prayer, at the conclusion of which they said the Lord's Prayer, then another stanza or two of the metre Psalms which they concluded with a Doxology, but the people sat likewise during all the time of this last prayer and Psalms, in the same manner as in those before the sermon, only they rose up at the Doxology, though some thought even that too superstitious (whether they generally stood up at the Lord's Prayer I am not so certain). After the Doxology the congregation was dismissed with the Blessing, but indeed most of them did not wait for it, for all the time it was apronouncing they were running out of the Church like so many sheep breaking out of a fold, in the greatest hurry and confusion; nay, from the time the sermon was ended, the people, in many places at least, began gradually to drop out; for in truth the hearing of it was the only design they had in coming to Church."

Morer's account given from his own experience towards the close of our period is perhaps the most interesting. "First, the precentor about half an hour before the preacher comes, reads two or three chapters to the congregation of what part of scripture he pleases, or as the minister gives him directions. As soon as the preacher gets into the pulpit the precentor leaves reading and sets a psalm, singing with the people till the minister by some sign orders him to give over. The psalm over, the preacher begins, confessing sins and begging pardon, exalting the holiness and majesty of God and setting before him our vileness and propensity to transgress his commandments. Then he goes to sermon, delivered always by heart, and therefore sometimes spoiled by tattologies, little impertinences, and incoherence in their discourses. The sermon finished, he

returns to prayer, thanks God for that opportunity to deliver his word, prays for all mankind, for all Christians, for that particular nation, for the sovereign and royal family without naming any, for subordinate magistrates, for sick people, especially such whose names the precentor hands up to him, then concludes with the Lord's Prayer to sanctify what was said before. After this another psalm is sung named by the minister, and frequently suited to the subject of his sermon, which done he gives the benediction, and dismisses the congregation for that time."

From such descriptions by eye-witnesses of what was practised in different places and from the hints we gather from church records, we recognise that the service was very much what John Knox had prescribed. The church building was not altered in episcopal times, and was a bare hall with probably one or two lofts or galleries, the pulpit in the middle of the south wall (as at Alyth), with a sandglass attached, and a ring for holding the basin of water on baptismal occasions; beneath the pulpit the lattron or reader's desk; somewhere close by the stool of repentance or pillar or pillarie; in some churches also a special seat for the elders; the rest of the church divided into sections where stood the "dasks" of the various heritors and their tenants and in some churches (as in Peebles in 1669) a part set aside for women. The minister in his black gown and bands would appear from the manse at the third bell, the first having rung early in the morning as a time signal, and the second at the commencement of the reader's service. The collection had already been taken in a plate at the door under the eyes of elders. The metrical psalms without instrumental accompaniment were used. The sermon (as throughout the rest of the century) was from an "ordinary," which meant a text treated exhaustively during a period of many Sundays. During the prayers the people were expected (as in Dunblane) to kneel or stand, but seem often to have simply remained sitting. Irreverence in church is frequently mentioned in the records.

Communion was celebrated once a year, as had been the practice in Presbyterian times, though many cases are on record

where it was, for one reason or another, omitted for years. It was only supposed to be celebrated after the minister and elders had catechised the people and had distributed "tokens" or "tickets" to those whose character and knowledge were satisfactory. In the Auchterhouse session minutes in 1677 we read: "The minister intreats because the givinge of the Communion approacheth that the elders be carefull in their severall quarters to search who are at variance and discord with their neighbours and either reconcile them or els delait them to the session, to the end those who are contumacious and will not be reconciled may be debard from coming to the table of the Lord." At Kilbucho we have the minister complaining in 1668 that he lacked elders "to serve at the Lord's table," and to "inform him of the scandalous that he may debar them." At Inverness in 1675 we have the rule enunciated that the minister must "examen and catechise all his congregation at least once each yeare." At Ellon in 1670 there was a complaint against the minister to the effect that "the tyme ordinarily taken by him for catechising before the administration of the Lord's Supper was too scrimpe and short for such ane numerous and vaste congregation in catechising of some of which it is given out he is too superfitiall." At Alyth the minister sometimes catechised the parishioners by sections in the church, at other times examined them in their homes on week-days. A curious entry in the Old Machar session minutes shows that in 1684 part of the parish had not been catechised in time, but the people were allowed "to come with their elders to testify for them," and so to receive the necessary tokens to admit them to the table.

There was always a preparatory service, usually on the preceding Friday or Saturday, and a thanksgiving service on the following Monday. The names given to the occasion vary, and we hear of "Communion," "the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper," "the holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper," "the Holy Communion," "the holie Sacrament," "the holy Sacrament of the Supper," "the Sacrament," more rarely "the

Eucharist," "the Holy Eucharist," and once at Peebles in 1673 "the blessed memorial of our Saviour's death and passion."

The communicants sat round a long table or long tables specially erected in the body of the kirk and covered with white cloths. At Mauchline in 1673 two of the elders were appointed to confer with the local carpenter and arrange "what will be found necesar for mounting and making ready tables and formes for the Communion." The minister sat at one end of the long table, or sometimes at a "littel table," and the elders and deacons assisted. At Peebles, in July, 1670, four elders were set aside to look after the wine, four for the bread, one for the tokens, and two for the collection. At South Leith we hear on one occasion of elders appointed "to sit in chairs at ye head of ye tables at the ministers' backs . . . to stand at the head of the tables beside the ministers for decencie and ordering of the people . . . to stand at the south and north pillars at the east end of the tables to let the people out." At Alyth on the second communion day in the morning we read in 1672 of "10 tabells and ane halfe" being served.

Utensils were not always suitably available in these Episcopalian days any more than in the preceding period. Indeed one is astounded at the number of parishes all over the country which had to confess to having as at Cullen in 1676 "only communion tables and ane linnen table cloath given by the Countess of Finlater" but no cups or baptismal basin, at Ordiquhill in 1677 no cloths, basin or cups, at Cushnie in 1675 no cups or table cloths, but tables and a "lavarre" for baptism, at Kildrummy in 1680 only a basin for baptism and two tables for communion, and so on. Usually we find two "tin" or pewter cups and, occasionally, as at Forglen, Clatt, etc., the cups are of silver. Very often we hear of cups being borrowed for communion. This had been the case at St. Machar's, Aberdeen, for some time before 1683, and few of the churches round about Inverness seem to have possessed vessels of their own at this date.

Morer's account of baptism and other references to it show that there was no font in use in the churches, but that after

sermon in church and questions put to the parents, involving an acceptance of the creed, the sacrament was administered with "water out of a bason conveniently fastened to the pulpit side." Baptism in private houses was strongly disapproved of, just as it had been by the Presbyterians at the time of the Five Articles of Perth.

Such were the main external features of Scottish Episcopacy in the reign of Charles II. There were no doubt perceptible differences in practice in different parts of the country, but we have mentioned cases from many districts and can from this draw fairly general deductions. It may be asserted that while certain bishops, and doubtless also certain ministers, aped English ways, the vast majority of ministers and congregations had no thought of so doing, and the indulged ministers would be still farther from anything that might even suggest England. It was only after the Revolution Settlement that the Scottish Episcopalians drifted in a definitely English direction, partly because of their own weakness and their consequent need of English sympathy and support, and their need to distinguish more sharply between themselves and the Presbyterians. Of course, in the middle of the seventeenth century English Episcopacy was not what we now find in England, but the evidence we have adduced will, I think, have confirmed what we otherwise know as to the remarkably small external differences between seventeenth century Presbyterianism and the practice of the Scottish Episcopalians in the reign of Charles II. In that period there was established a most interesting actual compromise between the two systems, a compromise which ought not to be forgotten by anyone interested in bringing about some better understanding between our two great national churches to-day.

G. D. HENDERSON.

CANTERBURY ADMINISTRATION.

The Administrative Machinery of the Archbishop of Canterbury illustrated from Original Records. By IRENE JOSEPHINE CHURCHILL, D.PHIL., Assistant Lambeth Librarian. 2 Vols. (S.P.C.K.).

I.

MISS CHURCHILL has written one of those invaluable books that are both quarries and guides. To the learned it will serve, like Professor Tout's *Chapters in Medieval Administrative History*, as a storehouse of fact and stimulus: to the novice, especially to the student faced for the first time with an archbishop's register, it will blaze the trail through the intricacies of medieval ecclesiastical administration. It will be found of great service also to the editors of episcopal registers, and, in general, to all who are concerned in the practical working of the diocesan system where it came (and, may we say, where it comes?) in contact with higher authority. Miss Churchill's book is the result of a prolonged and detailed study of the medieval registers at Lambeth. They are material with which no Church historian writing on the later Middle Ages in England can dispense. What other country in Europe, apart from the Papal See, has the equal of this great series?

Her book may justly be termed an introduction to these registers, for her delineation of the archiepiscopal system before Pecham and Winchelsey is comparatively slight. It is in the analysis of specific records that she excels. Their interest is three-fold, corresponding to the position of the archbishop himself. He was both diocesan and metropolitan; and, in addition, he had legatine powers which find express mention in the judicial commissions issued to the members of his court. Now to say exactly which of the archbishop's functions were diocesan, which metropolitan and which legatine is a very complicated task, and Miss Churchill, alive to the fine confusions of history,

has shown much caution in attacking the problem: "We shall often be confronted with no small difficulty in determining under which authority one who is styled Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of All England and Legate of the Apostolic See, is acting in specific instances, whether by diocesan, by reserve of metropolitical authority, or by virtue of his legatine powers." The compilers of the registers, Miss Churchill observes, generally did not give the matter much thought: for them it was *dominus* who acted, and that was enough. But the modern reader will, for instance, be anxious to know exactly what the legatine power meant, and how it differed from the metropolitical; and for an answer to this question Miss Churchill will take us back to the Bull of Alexander III, between 1165 and 1170, when the pope told the suffragans of Canterbury, in answer to certain complaints, that while by metropolitical right the archbishop could hear no cause coming from the bishoprics except by appeal, none the less by right of his legation he could and ought to hear all causes, whether by appeal or complaint, as the vice-gerent of the pope. The decision of the committee of enquiry into the archbishop's judicial powers held in Pecham's time associated this power of proceeding directly (in cases of complaint) with the archbishop's own personal jurisdiction rather than with that of the Court of Canterbury, in later parlance, with the Audience rather than with the Court of Arches. But in practice the archbishop did not press the demarcation between the legatine authority and the prerogative of his church of Canterbury, and he would have been very unmedieval had he done so. And here we touch upon a point that Miss Churchill's book perpetually brings home to the reader: the subtlety of contemporary distinctions in law and the blurring of them in actual fact. It is the same with the *personnel* about the archbishop. The trusted familiar may be turned on to jobs which, strictly speaking, other administrators with commissions granted for these purposes ought, according to all appearances, to be doing. There is a fluidity and flexibility which betokens the well-running machine, but is highly perplexing to historians of to-day. Yet perhaps the student who very naturally searches for these distinctions and takes them *au pied de la lettre* may himself need to revise his ideas about administration. The test is in the working, rather than in the rigid application of the

suum cuique principle. This is not to belittle the valuable lists of officials which Miss Churchill has given at the end of her second volume. If it is sometimes a trifle difficult (e.g., in the case of Henry Penwortham) to draw the obvious line between the registrar of the court of Canterbury and the registrar of the archbishop; if in the list of auditors William Byconylle (mentioned 1st November, 1440) has slipped out of his place between the warden of All Souls and master John Stokes (ii, 243), or if among the deans of Bocking (ii, 233) John Stevenys does not figure between master William Cavendish and master John Kakeby, that is nothing to grumble at. Even in the fifteenth century we can never be quite sure of the permanent departmentalisation of the archbishop's staff, and it is to be noted that the general commissions to officials printed by Miss Churchill in her second volume (pp. 176—228) do not follow the royal practice of assigning a term, however wide, for the tenure of appointments. Hence the vital importance that attaches to all the special commissions in the archbishop's registers.

The medieval archbishop of Canterbury was a diocesan prelate with those ordinary pastoral duties from which, in their modern guise, certain heady reformers would now like to set him free. He had all the duties which leave their mark in the ordinary bishop's registers—ordinations, dispensations, admission to benefices, the treatment of matters touching the *forum internum* and the rest. It is upon the conferment of benefices that Miss Churchill dwells longest, for the archbishop had under him a series of jurisdictions exempt from the bishop in whose diocese the territories lay, each under a dean whose powers varied according to the nature of his commission. The eight deaneries of the archbishop's peculiar jurisdiction that lay in London, Middlesex, Surrey, Essex and Buckinghamshire, were important reserves of patronage, and the deans were sometimes men of considerable importance. "Speaking generally," Miss Churchill observes, "the powers conveyed were those of archidiaconal jurisdiction." In addition to these peculiars, there were the separate parishes exempted from the jurisdiction of the archdeacon of Canterbury, which in some respects constituted the most interesting examples of delegated jurisdiction. The institutions recorded in Archbishop Chichele's register show that to these exempt parishes were collated, at

any rate in the first half of the fifteenth century, members of the archbishop's household and the Court of Canterbury. It might be difficult to put an experienced senior official of some standing under the jurisdiction of the archdeacon; he would be more contented with the supervision of the Commissary general of Canterbury, who also acted in the archbishop's peculiars. In the case of the exempt parishes it is the Commissary general, not the archdeacon, to whom the mandate for the induction of the new incumbent was sent. In dealing with the peculiars and the exempt parishes, Miss Churchill has treated in some detail the practice of delegation. In the life of the medieval church this was as necessary as in the heavily overburdened existence of a modern archbishop or bishop; and the general impression one gets is that the medieval primate was well served. But the point which will strike the reader who familiarises himself with the registers is the astonishing amount of work attended to by *dominus* in person. For it has to be remembered that, over and beyond his diocesan and his metropolitan functions, he is constantly occupied "in the arduous and urgent business of the kingdom," in the King's Council both in and out of parliament. Such tasks would have been impossible if he had not around him an efficient organisation to which he could delegate his work, both permanently and upon occasion, and so maintain the continuity of administrative action. For such diocesan work as could only be undertaken by someone of pontifical rank, he might have recourse to bishops, sometimes Irish, sometimes with titular sees, resident in England, who acted like the assistant bishop to-day. The archbishop generally took the ordinations himself, but dedication and consecration of churches and chapels and ceremonies, reconciliation of churches or churchyards after bloodshed or pollution, confirmations, and the blessing and sending of Chrism oil he could commission another to undertake. When he was out of his diocese for any length of time, a Vicar general, normally the prior of Christ Church, Canterbury, was appointed, and acted in all respects as diocesan. In the sections devoted to institutions and exchanges the registers contain separate *registra* of the acts of the Vicar general when the archbishop is out of England.

In his province the archbishop was metropolitan. The symbol of this authority was the delivery of the *pallium*,

which made him archbishop in the full sense of the term. His main duties here were the administration of vacant sees, the visitation of the dioceses within his province, the supervision of his suffragans both through correspondence with the individual bishop as well as through the dean of the province when general notices and mandates had to be sent; the summons and conduct of Convocation and the prerogative jurisdiction over wills of those with "notable goods in different dioceses of our province of Canterbury." Miss Churchill discusses each of these aspects very carefully. One may especially notice her very thorough examination of the arrangements for the governing of the spirituality in the vacant sees. In those of Lincoln, London, Salisbury and Worcester, during the time of Archbishop Boniface of Savoy, compositions or agreements were reached according to which the interests of the dean and chapter were consulted during the vacancy. In the first three cases the chapters secured that the administration should be in the hands of one of their own members. They had to submit to the archbishop the names of two or three of their number from whom he chose one as his Official in the diocese, to administer it with the exception of certain spheres reserved to the surveillance of the dean and chapter. The Worcester agreement gave greater powers to the chapter, but the later Norwich composition, while granting the archbishop nomination of the Official he wanted, reserved the visitation of the chapter, city and diocese between all three persons recommended by the chapter for this purpose. In the case of other sees when vacant, the archbishop was free to nominate whatever Official he chose. In point of fact he was likely to take some prominent member of the cathedral chapter. Miss Churchill shows that at any rate after 1321 the Official was regularly keeper and administrator of the spirituality. Particularly worth noting is her discussion of the question to what extent the Official appointed did in fact possess "the exercise of all jurisdiction competent to the bishop" and the power "of doing all else required by the premises." This leads naturally to the problem of the collation of benefices at such times. During the vacancy, the class of livings that were in the bishop's collation by reason of the advowson belonging to the temporalities of the see passed, except in the cases of Rochester and St. Asaph, into the hands of the king, and the Crown regularly

exercised its *regale*: but appointments to those livings which devolved upon the bishop by some rule of canon law were, for the most part, retained by the archbishop.

The metropolitan's part in the appointment of bishops in his province was not inconsiderable. It belonged to him to consecrate the elect, to receive the new bishop's profession of obedience, and to release to him the spiritualities of the see. He also sent an intimation of the consecration to the king, who thereupon bestowed upon the bishop the temporal estates of the church; and he further ordered the cathedral chapters of the clergy of the diocese to be obedient to their new ruler. The confirmation of elections by the archbishop is a somewhat more difficult point. Technically speaking, it belonged to the metropolitan to confirm: but with the growth of the Avignonese system whereby all bishoprics, when they fell vacant, were reserved to the papal see, the practice of confirmation by the Pope at the request of the newly-elected bishop seems to have been regularly adopted. As M. Mollat has shown in his *Introduction to the Litterae Communes* of John XXII, this began as a matter of precaution in cases of dispute, and on the whole appears to have been resorted to by abbots and priors rather than by bishops. It is interesting to note how complete was the system of papal provision to sees. Miss Churchill quotes a weighty opinion to the effect that after the passing of the statutes of Provisors and *Praemunire* "the kings of England became in every way masters of the situation. The forms of capitular election and of Papal provision continued, but the chapters invariably elected and the popes invariably provided the royal nominee." This is broadly, but only broadly true. We venture to doubt whether the "statutes" in question, while they certainly were directed, and directed effectively, against the acceptance of prebends and other benefices from the Holy See, did much to alter the system of appointing the bishops; and the study of Martin V's provisions shows, furthermore, that the king did not always succeed in getting the man he wanted appointed to the see he specially desired to fill, though he was generally successful in securing his candidate's promotion to the episcopate somewhere. This limitation naturally applies in particular measure to translation, which, whatever representations the king might make, lay solely in Papal hands. It is most difficult to generalise about the

higher provisions. So much went on behind the scenes.¹ Only the unofficial letters of people at the Curia like the notary and proctor William Swan can really tell us exactly how much responsibility for an appointment lay with the Pope and how much with the king. Miss Churchill does well to remind us of the one short period of exception to the normal form of papal provision, the years 1416 and 1417, when the Holy See was vacant and the Council of Constance was sitting. Then election by the chapter upon the king's nomination, and confirmation by Archbishop Chichele, were substituted for the normal procedure.

The next two sections in Miss Churchill's book are of great importance. First, visitation. The archbishop's visitation of the dioceses in his province was not undertaken until he had visited his own. This done, he might get permission from the Papacy to visit his suffragans either in person or by commissaries; but the practice had not been established without difficulty from the suffragans or from religious houses that claimed to be exempt, or indeed without murmurs being heard against the procurations demanded. It was this latter kind of "popular" detail that was eagerly registered by that admirable barometer, Matthew Paris. The fullest early detailed account, Miss Churchill shows, is for the visitation of Archbishop Courtenay. She points out that when the archbishop visited the diocese of Exeter, the bishop, Thomas de Brantingham, opposed, not the actual visitation, but the exercise by the archbishop and his commissaries during the visitation of jurisdiction which normally belonged to the archbishop and his officers. This was a grievance dating from the time of Archbishop Pecham. The objection was that, in addition to the enquiries, which he had a perfect right to make, the archbishop also administered the see during the visitation. This supersession by the archbishop of all inferior jurisdiction during the inquisitorial period was essential to the metropolitanical visitation, and it was maintained against all opposition. The sees of Exeter and Salisbury constituted the only examples of serious resistance to

¹ This is especially the case in 1425 and 1426. The Papal provisions of these years are being examined by Dr. Dorothy Newell in a forthcoming essay, based on the letters of William Swan.

the archbishop's claim to perform the ordinary functions of the diocese, such as institutions and the proving of testaments. Ever after Courtenay's time the archbishop's claims were accepted. Under Arundel exemptions may be alleged, as in the case of the University of Oxford (Miss Churchill might here have quoted from the documents in Snappe's Formulary), but opposition from the diocesan was not forthcoming. One reason perhaps was that there was a tendency for visitation to be carried out in sees that were vacant, or from which the archbishop was absent. In Chichele's time the visitation of Salisbury was carried out *sede plena*; but at Rochester in 1423 the bishop was away, and in Lincoln (1424) the see was empty. Miss Churchill observes that no details of the latter visitation have been incorporated in the archbishop's register. There is, it is true, no separate section for this visitation in the Chichele register, but particulars can be gleaned from among the institutions as well as from the testaments. Incidentally, there is a complete section that gives the admissions to benefices in the diocese of Lincoln at the end of Chichele's institutions.

Secondly, convocation. The archbishop was, as metropolitan, president of the provincial council or (if we may accept the identification) convocation. To this assembly his suffragans, the deans of cathedral and collegiate churches, the prelates of the religious orders, and the clergy, secular and regular, through their proctors, were summoned by the bishop of London, dean of the province. (Miss Churchill has noted the puzzling marginal in the Chichele register which calls the latter prelate *cancellarius*. This office was, as Lyndwood shows us, one belonging to the bishop of Winchester, who is more properly termed sub-dean.) Convocation was particularly important, not only because it was the meeting of the clergy of the province at which constitutions were debated and promulgated and, in the later middle ages, the trials for heresy took place, but also because it was the organ that granted subsidies to the king and made remonstrances or forwarded petitions to him when clerical liberties were infringed. Miss Churchill might, we think, have treated with advantage the statutory activities of the provincial council in its early days with special reference to the acts of the Fourth Lateran or the activities of the papal legates *a latere*; and in the later stages she might have shown how close was the co-operation of convocation with parliament, especially

in the suppression of Lollardy. But she has preferred, here as elsewhere, to stick closely to the registers, so that what we lose in general effect, we gain in detail.² She has at any rate shown how very general was the scope of convocation in the fifteenth century: it might deal with the promotion of university graduates, with the question of sending and subsidising representatives to the General Councils, with the observance of festivals or with papal encroachments. Where so many good things are noticed, it would be unfair to utter any complaint, but we cannot help wishing for a treatment of the later medieval convocation upon more generous lines. We could have spared some of the detail upon the *sede vacante* compositions for more information on this important topic, one of high interest to historians of parliament and of constitutional matters generally; for the convocation record that begins with Archbishop Islep's time has been much abbreviated by Wilkins, and one of the first tasks of the new edition of the *Concilia* must be to restore the vital narrative of these assemblies.

II.

The second half of the book is one that deserves the closest scrutiny. It is a treatment, notable for its delicacy and caution, of the different forms taken by the archbishop's jurisdiction. The prerogative, the Arches or court of the province, and the archbishop's own *Audientia causarum*. Under the first of these heads the archbishop, as metropolitan, claimed that the probate, the administration of goods, the hearing of the final accounts and dismissal of executors, in the case of all dying testate or intestate that had notable goods in more than one diocese of the province, belonged to the archbishop by the prerogative of the Church of Canterbury. "This was but for the archbishop to claim for the province what each of his suffragans claimed in his diocese, namely, that where goods lay in several jurisdictions, he, as superior, could issue to the advantage of those subject to him a probate and a grant of

² It seems unfair to charge Miss Churchill with too great devotion to her texts; but here and there throughout the book more synthesis would have greatly helped the general reader, without detracting from the scholarly qualities of the work.

administration to cover all, instead of separate letters of administration being taken out in each jurisdiction.”³ The claim to the exercise of this right was strongly enforced. Such probates were granted by a single paramount authority working, in the later fourteenth and part of the fifteenth centuries, in two sections: the archbishop or his commissaries on the one hand, and the permanent “keepers” of the prerogative domiciled in Ivy Lane. Until the middle of the fifteenth century the archbishop appears regularly to have proved wills himself; but his personal functions seem thereafter to have ceased, and prerogative jurisdiction, to use the phrase of the administrative historian, to have gone “out of court.” Until this event, therefore, the wills proved by the prerogative jurisdiction are to be found both in the archbishop’s registers (one section) as well as in the records of the keepers (the other), now at Somerset House. From them we can reconstruct the testamentary jurisdiction of the archbishop over *mobilia* far more conclusively than we can analyse the work done in the other two tribunals, the court of Canterbury proper (the Arches) or the archbishop’s own Audience. Of the court of Canterbury, the *alma curia de arcubus London.*, Stubbs wrote that it was a court of appeal from all diocesan courts of the province and likewise (whether or not by virtue of the archbishop’s legatine capacity) a court of first instance in all ecclesiastical matters. Now the difficulty here is the lack of early court books and records of cases to determine its exact sphere and its relations with the other bodies. Miss Churchill has had to draw upon “stray mandates, citations, sentences and appeals that have survived by being entered in some archiepiscopal or episcopal register or in the pages of precedent books, so far as these are known and available.” Fortunately she has been able to find in the Precedent Book preserved in the diocesan registry at Rochester an important series of cases ranging from 1376 to 1434 which help to clear up the confusions which surround the whole

³ But, in actual fact, they sometimes were. Cf. the probates of the wills of William de Roos (at Lidlington), John Marmiun (Sleaford Castle), Robert Boteler (Lidlington), John Dabridgecourt and Edward, duke of York (Old Temple), by the bishops of Lincoln (A. Gibbons, *Early Lincoln Wills*, 1888, pp. 136, 130, 116, 117, 146). These wills were also proved by Archbishop Chichele and are given in his register.

subject. What for example was the relation between the Official, who was judge of the court, and the Dean of the Arches? To what extent was the court of Canterbury a court of first instance? We may quote in full Miss Churchill's opinion in regard to the former point:

"... the commissions so far show the Official and the Dean of the Arches as holders of two distinct offices, though the designation of the court, both as the Court of Canterbury and apparently also as the Court of the Arches, suggests where the origin for the confusion is to be sought. Certainly the entries in the Precedent Book, wherever the official titles are written in full without contraction, leave no doubt that, where the Dean of the Arches is acting in the Court of Canterbury, he is doing so as Commissary-general of the Official, and it is equally clear that in the absence of both the Official and the Dean their place as president of the court was taken by the Examiner-general."

As regards the scope of the Arches the evidence shows that it was a court of appeal for the province from diocesan and lower courts. One form of appeal is particularly interesting, that is, the "tutorial" type. This was based upon the right of the archbishop to protect the goods and person of the appellant, pending litigation, from the jurisdiction of the diocesan. The suffragans of Canterbury raised objections to these tutorial appeals during the time of Archbishop Pecham, and the archbishop had to make certain modifications in his practice. Under this appeal the appellant, in a *provocatio*, a form of public instrument, states that, fearing that something is about to be done to his prejudice, he appeals to the apostolic see and for the protection of the Court of Canterbury. The protection, if granted, lasted for a year and a day, during which time the appellant was supposed to take all necessary steps for prosecuting his suit. It was, of course, a way of getting a suit from a lower jurisdiction into the sphere of the Court of Canterbury, before definitive sentence had been given in the court of lower jurisdiction. Miss Churchill reviews in great detail this tutorial work, which provides some answers to the question of how far the court might act as one of first instance. None the less the tutorial appeal is not quite first instance work. There is also a difficulty here about the legatine functions of

the archbishop, which, as we have seen, might very properly be considered to belong to him in his Court of Audience. It would be safer, as Miss Churchill tends to do, to suspend judgment upon the question of first instance until the tutorial system has been more thoroughly investigated.

Equally difficult is the question of the sphere of the archbishop's Audience. This court dealt with the residue of appeals made directly by complaint or otherwise to the archbishop. Here, as in the case of the prerogative, the archbishop might delegate his powers to others, while at the same time he also gave general powers to certain people to hear and determine all cases that came to the Audience. A particular problem is the relations that existed between the Official of the Court of Canterbury and the Auditors, whether special or general. Sometimes, as with Lyndwood himself, we find that the Official or the Dean of the Arches has his Commissary general acting in the archbishop's Audience. Perhaps the real solution is that the Audience was the more ancient, more informal body, the original organism, superior in atmosphere and dignity to other bodies, in the same way as the court *coram rege* was, owing to its personal connexion with the king, superior to other delegated jurisdictions. Yet, as in the secular instance, the *personnel* to which the archbishop might delegate his functions would none the less sit and hear cases in the older body; and it is indeed appropriate that the legatine powers should early have been associated with the primitive organism.

This is not all. Miss Churchill deals with the archbishop's jurisdiction outside England, with the relations of the ecclesiastical and secular authorities, particularly over criminous clerks and the issue of the writs of prohibition, and with the financial administration of the province of Canterbury as a whole. She ends the first volume with an invaluable survey of the changes in law and administration made at the Reformation. All those who wish to understand the vitally important transformations made between 1532 and 1534 ought to read her Epilogue. The legislation of Henry VIII was not directed against the metropolitan and diocesan powers of the archbishop. The papal authority was removed, but the powers exercised by the archbishop as *legatus natus* were not necessarily abolished thereby. "There was no intention of restricting the archbishop in the use of any of his powers hitherto exercised if their use was of

service to the king and the realm." Papal authority was to go, and in its place was put the royal supremacy; so that, for example, licences as hitherto granted by Rome could only be granted by the archbishop under royal authority. The archbishop naturally gave up the title *Apostolice sedis legatus* but took on certain of the powers for issuing licences and so forth, hitherto obtained from the Roman pontiff. The necessary organisation for this was created when the archbishop, in 1538, appointed a Commissary or Master of the Faculties.

The second volume of Miss Churchill's work contains a valuable series of illustrative documents relating to each part of the substantive work. It will be of much service to editors, though perhaps the specialist student of diplomatic may find some of his requirements unsatisfied. But Miss Churchill is not thinking of him so much as of those whom she is introducing to the study of the archbishop's administration and administrators. For the light that this book casts upon that devoted *personnel*, which she is the first modern student thoroughly to investigate, is her most noteworthy contribution to her subject. The reader must not expect to find here a cleverly-proportioned and harmonious work. Much of the evidence is perplexing, and is merely stated and left as such. There is not much attempt at comparisons; York does not figure prominently, and continental practice only very spasmodically. Miss Churchill has given us an indispensable review of the facts for the province of Canterbury, and has not claimed to do more. We note with pleasure in her introductory pages her reference to the Lambeth librarian.

E. F. JACOB.

QUERIES ON THE PRAYER BOOK.

I sit in the shade of a kindly tree, with a cool breeze—characteristic of these hills—tempering the heat, which would otherwise be about 100 in the shade.

By way of occupation I read Bishop Dowden's *Workmanship of the Prayer Book*, a most delightful book, and as I read queries arise in my mind.

Not long since I sat at a council table, at a meeting of a committee on the Prayer Book, a committee composed of men like myself whose only qualification—where it existed—to sit on such a committee was a desire to improve our present Prayer Book. It was not an “edifying” committee in the strict sense of the word, perhaps I may add luckily, as we were only attempting to deal with two things, the Lord's Prayer and the Apostles' Creed: and the profound ignorance which marked our deliberations, coupled with an equally remarkable light-heartedness in being ready to vote in spite of that, made it decidedly fortunate that we came to no conclusions which could possibly command the assent of our General Synod. But as I listened, queries some new, some old, came to the surface of my mind.

Before setting down a few of these queries, let me explain in as few words as possible our present situation as regards the Prayer Book.

(1) Three of our dioceses were founded by the American Church, and naturally have been using translations of the American Prayer Book. One was founded by the Church of England in Canada. Seven were founded from England, and have used or are using various translations of the English Prayer Book of 1662.

(2) We are now all of us integral parts of one church, the C.H.S.K.H., with its own General Synod. There is a desire on the part of some of us to have one Book of Common Prayer.

Some of us think the time is not yet come, others think delay only adds to the difficulties of the situation. Nearly twenty years ago, a book was produced which endeavoured to combine the various "uses," printing side by side the English and American texts where they differed: but that experiment was really a failure. Our present policy seems to be to try for agreement in particular details and so perhaps to work towards a common book hereafter. Such details are the Lord's Prayer, the Creeds, the Confessions, the Confirmation Service, and so on.

(3) The situation is simpler than it is at home, because we are not revising a generally accepted book, and therefore we have in some ways a freer hand: but the situation is in two respects at least more complicated: one, that we are urged on by our Chinese brethren, very naturally but very dangerously, because they know even less than we do and have no inherited loyalty to "the old book" with all its age-long history behind it: the other that we have to agree on matters of *translation*, and these are fruitful causes of disagreement.

But when all is said and done, one must have a Prayer Book (or Prayer Books) and the more satisfactory it or they may be, the better for the church. If we are to wait until there are competent men amongst ourselves, our present mistakes and imperfections will have become ingrained and very difficult to rectify. It is surely possible that some of those at home who are really learned and wise will be willing to give a little time to the queries I propose to set down in this article as samples. Two of those to whom I used to look with confidence are now no more—F. E. Brightman and Cuthbert Turner—but there must be others unknown to such an out-of-date person as myself, who will give us the benefit of their wisdom.

I.

My first queries will concern *the Lord's Prayer*.

(1) Westcott used to emphasise that the words "on earth as in heaven" might well refer to all three previous clauses. Our English version, as it used to be printed, more or less ruled that out. (But to my surprise I see the punctuation is changed *all through* the 1928 book!) In Chinese, a very slight altera-

tion from our present translation (comparable to omitting the words "it is" in English) would make this sense possible without excluding the sense given in our former English text. *Is this worth while?* And will someone tell me what is the correct English version, that which I have known all my life, or that printed in the 1928 book?

(2) We are (fortunately) more or less agreed as to the rendering of "daily": but we are not agreed as to the word for "bread." As far as I know I stand almost alone in trying to secure the same word as is used in the texts "I am the bread of life" "the true bread." The translators of our New Testament, I suppose in their desire to be colloquial, have "food and drink." I am afraid we have no proper word equivalent to *arton*, but I cannot think "food and drink" a good equivalent. Will my wiser brethren at home support me in trying for the same word as in the text "the bread of life"? Or do they think we must keep a more colloquial term?

(3) We are all familiar with the apparent discrepancy between different texts which contain *peirasmos* or temptation, in the New Testament. The way out—not always found perhaps—is to distinguish between two meanings of temptation, testing, and drawing away into sin. In our Chinese language it is perfectly easy to use two different words, one for testing, the other for drawing away. Is it right to use the *latter* in the Lord's Prayer? Most of our versions now in use read "Do not cause us to meet testing," whereas I venture to insist that our Lord meant us to pray against being "led away." If I am right, may we use the word which means this in our Lord's Prayer?

II.

I pass on to queries on the Apostles' Creed.

(4) I suppose we all agree that Almighty is not really a good equivalent for *pantocrator*: we probably all agree that it is impossible to change it to-day. But in putting forth a Chinese version of the Creed, after less than a hundred years of words which mean "almighty," is it worth while to try to substitute an expression which means all-sovereign (*pantocrator*)? It is just possible that the answer to this will be somewhat affected by the answer given to my next query,

because some might say "it is hardly worth while to make a change for this" and yet say "but if there must be a change, then include this."

(5) Our English Creed runs: "I believe in God the Father Almighty, maker etc." Our Chinese version has not only perpetuated the mistaken "Almighty," but has made what seems to me a graver mistake, in making it an epithet of "Father." "I believe in God, the Almighty Father, maker etc." I know of no passage in the Bible which supports this phrase, and I am inclined to think the original "*pantocrator*" in the Creed was a noun, not an epithet at all, or only so much of one as is the subsequent phrase "maker etc." My query then is this: is it not our obvious duty to correct this mistake, and adopt a text equivalent to "I believe in God, the Father, *pantocrator*, maker etc."?

(6) Some Chinese versions of the Creed have "rose from death" instead of "rose from (among) the dead." Is there any justification for that? Is it worth while to insist, as far as one can, on "from the dead"?

(7) "The Resurrection of the Body." Are we to keep this (as far as I know a very late innovation, 1543, in our English creed only, and never adopted in any Latin creed) or shall we go back to "of the flesh"? This seems to me quite an important point, though I am not sanguine of success if one suggested a return to what is undoubtedly a very difficult phrase.

III.

Morning and Evening Prayer.

(8) The revised English book has "An Introduction to." So far good. But I think what is printed in one of our Chinese books is better: namely to divide Morning and Evening Prayer into three parts, (1) the Preparation, (2) the Praise and Reading of God's Word, (3) the Prayers. Without going into details as yet, do any of my readers agree that this is a decided improvement?

(9) Coming now to details, the weakest point of the new English arrangement seems to me to be the confusion of the

penitential sentences with the proper sentences for the seasons. Some of the latter would surely come better after the confession and absolution and before "O Lord open thou our lips." But the next point is more important. The old custom, I believe, was to *begin* public worship or offices with the Lord's Prayer (Mattins, Prime, Vespers, Compline). So our first "Morning Prayer" began. Then there was added in 1552 the penitential introduction, but the Lord's Prayer was retained. Repetition (to those accustomed to say so many Paternosters or Aves) had no terrors for them, and in our own lifetimes we have known the Lord's Prayer used five times on Sunday morning, twice at Mattins, once in the Litany, and twice in the Communion Service. I venture to raise the question whether—in spite of the acknowledged liturgical precedent—we want to use it more than once: and, if only once, whether the beginning of the "Prayer" section of Morning Prayer is not the right place. In other words, is any support forthcoming for omitting it from the Preparation? i.e. to let that consist of the penitential sentences, the exhortation, confession, and "absolution." (It is quite foreign to the purpose of this article but the temptation is great, to add that a large print rubric might be added that under no circumstances shall a hymn, other than a really penitential hymn, be sung before this "preparation"!!)

But I really want light on this—to me very desirable—proposed change of omitting this first Lord's Prayer.

(10) The Praise and Reading section would then follow, beginning with the proper sentences for the seasons, and then the "O Lord open thou," etc.

My next query relates to the second versicle and response (see Bishop Dowden's *Workmanship*, etc., p. 172). The American Prayer Book omits them, and I confess I am impressed by Bishop Dowden's arguments. If we propose to omit them in our Chinese book, we shall meet of course with protests from the "English" dioceses. Is there any support in England for following the American precedent?

(11) My next query touches the Benedictus.

Our American brethren divide it after v. 4 and say that the last eight verses may be omitted except on the Sundays in

Advent. The late Bishop Gibson of Gloucester taught me at Wells to divide it after v. 8. Westcott and Hort's Greek text places a comma after v. 4, and one sees much reason to follow that. Can anyone give me justification for the American use?

(I ask because that question is quite sure to arise.)

(12) My next concerns the position of the Creed. In the Chinese Prayer Book already referred to it is the last item in the section on Praise. Our Confession of Faith sums up our Praises (just as the Gloria had introduced them) and therefore this seems the appropriate place for the rubrick which now follows the third collect in our English books. This is the place for the hymn or anthem, and *not* in the middle of the prayers. I should be glad of comments on this. (The American book has no such rubrick at Morning Prayer, only at Evening Prayer.)

(13) *The Lord's Prayer*. My query about this has already been suggested, but for clearness sake I repeat it. We are now entering on the third or Prayer section of Morning and Evening Prayer. Ought not the Lord's Prayer to be *always* used to introduce (as it were) the prayers that are to follow? Again I ask this, because the American book omits it here, unless the first Lord's Prayer has been omitted. This seems to me wrong. The only occasion when I would omit it *here* is when the last part of the Litany is to follow, where the Lord's Prayer sums up (as it were) all our previous prayers.

(14) The versicles and responses that follow were admirably in place in the Prayer Book of 1549. Some of them seem less in place now that fuller prayers for the same objects are set forth to follow them (for the king or state, for clergy and people, and for peace). So the American book omits all but two couplets at Matins, but prints them in full at Evensong. I am inclined to suggest printing them in full with a rubrick allowing for their omission (except the first and last couplet) whenever the corresponding prayers are to be said whether at Matins or Evensong. I should welcome comments on this suggestion.

In conclusion, I would ask all who read the foregoing, seemingly perhaps superfluous, suggestions and queries, to

remember two things: one, that *we* are not bound to the English book as you are in England, the other, that we are a church with a combined tradition, English and American, and we have to decide between the two where they differ, or else to adopt the clumsy expedient of printing both. I should be *very grateful* for replies, which can be given under the numbers attached to the queries.

FRANK L. NORRIS,

Bishop of North China.

Peking, China.

REVIEWS.

THE CHURCH OF IRELAND.

History of the Church of Ireland. Edited by WALTER ALISON PHILLIPS, LITT.D., M.R.I.A. Volumes II and III. (Oxford University Press. 1934).

WE reviewed the first volume of this excellent History in our April number. The work is now completed from the year A.D. 800 to the present day in two large volumes. It is scarcely possible in a short article to do justice to the fine and comprehensive series of learned essays by Irish scholars and churchmen, each of whom has made extensive research into the period undertaken. The editor is to be congratulated on the results of the work of ten different writers, and this division of labour has in no way detracted from the value or continuity of the history. Each author has concentrated on his own period and given an enormous wealth of facts and detail, fully illustrating the progress and the drawbacks, the fortunes and misfortunes of the church. And the extensive bibliographies at the end of each volume should prove a great help to the students of the history.

At the same time this is no dry chronicle. It is no question of "undertakers laying out the corpse of history." Far from it. The writers are very human, and know well how to present the pageant of history, with living characters and striking personality, and at times quite dramatic effect. Many good stories are told, often with a touch of natural Irish humour. The general style of writing is clear and concise, with no lengthy nor involved sentences, and altogether the reader is carried along easily and his interest is thoroughly sustained.

The first period dealt with in Volume II is from A.D. 800 to 1216, "The Scandinavian Inroads" and "The Movement Towards Rome," by the late Dr. Goddard Orpen. For two centuries the Northmen invaded the sea-port towns with their fleets, and, penetrating the country, caused great destruction

and pillage of the monasteries. In fear of these raids, the famous round towers of Ireland were built, as places of refuge, which the monks might occupy in cases of sudden attack, taking with them sacred vessels, shrines, MSS., and other property of value. After the great battle of Clontarf in 1014, "the Danes in Ireland gradually became Christians and abandoned piracy for trade." And in the eleventh century there was a reform movement in the church, which "consisted mainly of an assimilation to the Anglican or Roman ecclesiastical organisation." "Both archbishops and primate must be ordained by the Pope, or have received a pallum from Rome." This position led to Adrian's grant of Ireland to Henry II by virtue of the doubtful Donation of Constantine.

The next two chapters are written by the Ven. St. John Seymour, B.D., Litt.D., Archdeacon of Cashel, on "The Medieval Church," 1216 to 1509, beginning with the reign of King John, sometimes called the founder of Anglo-Ireland, as he built up in the country the fabric of legal monarchy, and introduced the judicial machinery of England, while incidentally the Irish Church was brought into complete conformity of organisation with that of England. The chapter headed "Side-lights" is very interesting. It is concerned with such subjects as the cult of relics, the custom of making pilgrimages, some peculiarities of the parochial system, the growth and vicissitudes of a monastery, the literature read therein, and medieval thought and customs.

The rest of this volume is on the Reformation period, by the Rev. Canon George V. Jourdan, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Dublin, who begins with a short account of the "Breach with Rome" (1509—1541) which consisted chiefly in the determination of the king to bring Ireland into the same position as England by forcing the Act of Supremacy on the Irish Parliament, and by erasing the name of Pope from all Primers and Prayer Books. There was no general change of religion, nor any popular desire for change. Little help was given by the publication of the Book of Common Prayer in *English*. It is a remarkable fact that no Irish edition of the Prayer Book was printed until the year 1608.

King Henry's aim was chiefly political. He knew that Ireland had to be conquered. But "as he would not or could

not spend the vast sum of money necessary his success was only partial."

The next chapter is headed "Reformation and Reaction" (1541—1558). In his effort to bring Ireland into line with England, Henry further proceeded with the dissolution of the monasteries, which had a disastrous effect, as a large number of parishes, having hitherto been served by the monks and friars, were left without ministers. In any case, it is admitted that "the majority of the bishops and the inferior clergy still maintained the beliefs and practices of former times." Of the progress of reform in Ireland during the reign of Edward VI no evidence is given. The question is dismissed in two rather contradictory paragraphs. In Mary's reign all anti-papal laws were repelled, and laws against heresy put into force, apparently without severe persecution, for, as, we are told, colonies of English Protestants arrived in Dublin to escape the persecutions in England.

The next chapter is called "The Transitional Stage of Reform." The immense power of the throne in Tudor times is shown by the extraordinary fact that Elizabeth sent the same minister to effect her will in Ireland—the Earl of Sussex, whom Mary had specially chosen for the restoration of papal authority. The *English Book of Common Prayer* was restored, with a curious provision added—that it shall be lawful for the clergy to say the services in Latin. Much of this chapter is occupied with the rebellion of Shane O'Neill, the perpetual wars of suppression, and the terrible state of the country.

It was a period of political conquest, and very little is said of religious reform. We read of the "Burninge of villages and the ruin of churches" and, in the following chapter, "The Rise of Recusancy," Sir Henry Sidney's letter to the Queen gives a lamentable picture of the state of the church in the diocese of Meath, where of the 224 parish churches only 52 could be said to be passably well served. In 105 there were no resident parsons or vicars . . . "In maney Places, the very walles of the Churches doune; verye few Chauncells covered, Wyndowes and dores ruyned or spoiled . . . and upon the Face of the Earthe, where Christ is professed, there is not a Church is so myserable a Case." Later we read an account of an inquiry

into the state of Cavan, where "the churches are for the most part in ruins; such as were presented to be in reparation, are covered only with thatch. But the incumbents, both parsons and vicars, did appear to be such poor, ragged, ignorant creatures, as we could not esteem any of them worthy of the meanest of these livings, albeit many of them are not worth above 40^s. per annum."

It is clear that the parish clergy at this time were in general wholly uneducated, and utterly inefficient so far as their spiritual duties were concerned. To meet the urgent necessity of higher education Trinity College, Dublin, was founded (1594), but beyond this effort we do not hear of much definite advance in the "Movement Towards a Doctrinal Reformation" which is stated to be the subject of the next chapter. It is rather the record of the continued ruthless war of conquest, which alienated the mass of the people more than ever from the religion of the conquerors, whose campaign is aptly described as "politico-religious" in order to force on Ireland a legal-ecclesiastical settlement, with the absolute supremacy of the Crown. In such circumstances there was little or no spiritual influence for reformation, and "at the beginning of King James's reign the fortunes of the Church of Ireland were at a low ebb . . . and the only religious organisation that was functioning with insight, zeal and power was the Roman Catholic." This is a strong and candid admission. It amounts to this, that from a religious and spiritual point of view the Reformation in Ireland was a failure. The attempt to force a change of religion had the effect of stirring up the great majority of the Irish people to religious, in addition to political, rebellion. The latter was crushed, but the former succeeded.

But under such unexpected and difficult conditions there was a remarkable revival of the welfare of the church of the minority. This renewal is traced through the next three hundred years in the third volume, to which there are six contributors, the first being Canon Jourdan, who writes of the "Church During the Reign of Charles I," when there was a definite improvement and advance. The principal causes may be summed up briefly as follows: The interest of the King shown in his Royal Letter against abuses, the Regal Visitation of 1633 and his encouragement of education; the appointment

of better bishops; the Commissions of Wentworth for the repair of church buildings; the influence of Laud and Bramhall; the assembly of Convocation and the passing of a separate book of Constitutions and Canons for the regulation of the Church of Ireland; and, in order to raise the status and position of the clergy, several Acts were passed by Parliament for the improvement of the temporalities of the church. Much was done, but the church suffered a terrible persecution by the great Insurrection of 1641, when a plot was formed to overthrow the English power in Ireland, and at the same time the Roman Church made a determined effort "to consolidate and legalise its position: but the rise to power of Cromwell dashed to the ground the hopes of the Protestant and Roman clergy alike," and, as in England, the Book of Common Prayer was forbidden.

Two chapters follow by Dr. H. Murray, Canon of Worcester, on the "Church of the Restoration" and of "The Revolution" (1660 to 1702). At the accession of Charles II the first question which arose in Ireland was, what form the restored church organisation should take. "The Presbyterians hoped that the King would sanction the establishment of their own model." As the position of the Presbyterian is little understood, it is worth while to give some figures, even though of a rather later date. In 1672 Sir William Petty estimated the total population of Ireland to be 1,200,000. Of this number he reckoned the Roman Catholics at 800,000, the remaining 400,000 being Protestants. Of the latter, rather more than half were churchmen, while the rest were mainly Presbyterians concentrated in Ulster.

But the Crown and the Government did not favour Presbyterians, and the restoration of the church was conspicuously marked in 1662 by the unique and spectacular consecration of no less than two archbishops and ten bishops on one day in St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, "a striking demonstration of the union of church and state." Evil days, however, were again to come, for James II was determined to make the Romanists dominant. Tyrconnell was appointed commander-in-chief in Ireland. A systematic oppression of Protestants began, and many fled to England, including eight bishops. After King William's victory of the Boyne the church had to embark once more on another reorganisation.

The history of the eighteenth century is covered in the two following chapters by Dr. D. A. Chart, Commissioner of Historical Manuscripts, who marks the assembly of Convocation in 1703, after an intermission of 37 years, as the first notable event in the reign of Queen Anne. The Lower House drew up a general consideration of reforms needed in the church, but for many years following Convocation apparently possessed comparatively little influence, and the advance of the church was chiefly dependent on state legislation, and the increased activity of the bishops. Two great and well known names emerge in this period — Jonathan Swift, Dean of St. Patrick's, and George Berkeley, Bishop of Cloyne. Of Swift, Dr. Chart says that "he was destined more than perhaps any other man of his age to arouse his country and vindicate her position before the world." Swift was the author of the famous aphorism: "Government without the consent of the governed is the very definition of slavery," when in the Drapier letters he won a primary victory for the country "against the misguided system of regarding Ireland as a kind of outlying farm to be run mainly in the interests of Great Britain." There is an ironical and melancholy humour in this apposite reflection.

Bishop Berkeley, whose fame rests chiefly on his philosophy, was devoted to Ireland and his diocese, where he constantly resided and worked with zeal among his people. Speaking generally, this was an uneventful period in the history of the church, which, however, "exercised an unchallenged domination in its own sphere, and through some of its statesmen bishops also took a large part in the control of the state."

A survey of the work of the church during the next forty years shows that progress was steady but slow. More churches were provided, and an improved class of clergy, though there was a type still too prominent, thus racily described by one bishop: "Consider in the desk his distracted thoughts, his wandering looks, his irreverent attitudes, his careless, hasty, unintelligible recitation . . . consider in the pulpit with what a cold and icy tongue he chills the divine ardour that probably glows in every line of the original he has copied."

We now arrive at the most interesting story of the nineteenth century, which culminated in the "Disestablishment of

the Church in Ireland," told by the Rev. N. D. Emerson, LL.B., PH.D. Political and legislative union included ecclesiastical, and a United Church of England and Ireland was established in 1801. Thirty years later there arose what is sometimes called the "Seven Years' Tithe War," a terrible time for the church and country. There followed in 1847 the disastrous famine, which reduced the population by more than two millions. A census taken in 1861 showed that the Roman Catholics numbered $4\frac{1}{2}$ millions, and members of the Established Church less than 700,000, while the total revenue of the church amounted to about £600,000 a year. We may pass over the political side of Mr. Gladstone's Act of Disestablishment, viewed by the church with the greatest hostility as iniquitous confiscation.

But the concluding chapters on "The Reconstruction of the Church since the Disestablishment," by the Dean of Ross, Dr. Webster, show that the result was a movement towards a spiritual and religious revival beyond all expectation. Now, sixty years later, Dr. Webster is able to admit that many of the faults of the Established Church were in reality the outcome of her connexion with the state. A detailed account of the new life of the church would be too long for this present review. It would require an article, if not a book, to itself. We think that Dr. Webster might have said a great deal more than he has done on this significant regeneration, which penetrated into every parish. It was due largely to the splendid co-operation between the clergy and laity who, in the National Synod and throughout the whole country, have continuously worked together for the welfare of the church. There is a sad side, however, to the picture, in the diminishing church population since the Revolution of 1916, and its consequent effects. Even in this great crisis the Church in Ireland maintained its dignified position and influence, and can be said to be on good terms with its neighbours and the Government of the Irish Free State.

In a final estimate of the value of this capital history we have one criticism to make. In several cases scarcely enough consideration is given to the causes and effects of the events narrated. Possibly the writers refrain in the expectation that their readers will work these out for themselves. But, taken

as a whole, in the planning and carrying out of the work there is a freedom and unity of design remarkable in a series written by so many different authors.

Another point is worthy of notice. In reaction from the dominant Roman influence, the Church in Ireland, while fully realising its position as a branch of the Holy Catholic Church, is very definitely Protestant. In these circumstances we are inclined to think that it would be difficult for any modern historian to write a history of the church in its relation to Romanism without finding his attitude somewhat pre-determined by his views of religion and society at the present day. But, exempt from any Olympian indifference, the various writers in these volumes are on the whole fair, impartial, and dispassionate in the face of the unfortunate and lasting controversy bequeathed by the medieval to the modern Christian Church. There may be, more or less, some signs of partisanship, but never in the least vindictive, nor calculated to wound susceptible feeling.

In conclusion we have only to say that this is a fine work, easy and pleasant to read, and a valuable production of the modern school of history in Ireland.

PONSONBY SULLIVAN.

Peter Sterry: Puritan and Platonist. By VIVIAN DE SALES PINTO. (Cambridge University Press. 1934). 12s. 6d.

PETER STERRY is a well known name to students of the seventeenth century, but few of them have ever read a line of his works. They have been content to know that Baxter once asked concerning him and his friend, Sir Harry Vane, "whether vanity and sterility had ever been more happily conjoined?" Then in 1926, Mr. F. J. Powick stirred curiosity by a very interesting chapter in his work on the *Cambridge Platonists*; and now Professor Pinto has produced a first-rate book, and half of it consists of selections from Sterry's writings.

Those who remember that Sterry was a member of the Westminster Assembly, and was the favourite chaplain of

Oliver Cromwell, would expect him to be labelled as Puritan, Independent, Scholar and Mystic, but none of these labels really fit him—Sterry was an Emerson born out of due time.

He was brought up in a Puritan household, and was sent to the Puritan College of Emmanuel, Cambridge, just when Emmanuel was burying its Puritans and setting up a nursery for Platonists. There was little that was puritanical about Sterry. Nature he loved, and after Nature Art—music, painting and literature. He turned away from a harsh and narrow creed. He was gentle and tolerant, and always had many friends in the Church of England. He only became "a notorious Independent" because of his dislike for Presbyterians, "whose constitution, methods and discipline laboured to hedge in the wind, and to bind up the sweet influences of the spirit."

His Independency had nothing in common with the Ironsides. He was no more a Calvinist than Jeremy Taylor, and would have been even more emphatic on the liberty of prophesying. He was an Independent because he felt no need for corporate worship or institutional religion; he refused to be bound by any creed or formulary, or to be made responsible for the souls of others. He never was beneficed. He had a passion for freedom of thought and action, but went resolutely his own way without any clamour.

He was a man of vast and varied learning with which he decorated his writings, but he was not a scholar in the true sense for he had never submitted to any intellectual discipline. He had been influenced to a certain extent by Plato and more by Plotinus, but he knew nothing of discipleship. He started in consequence on the adventure of thinking for himself without any clear conception of whence or whither, trusting, not altogether in vain, to flashes of intuition. We suspect, in consequence, that he is better read in selections than at large. At any rate, we found the one long extract given by Professor Pinto wearisome reading, while we were often thrilled by the shorter paragraphs.

He is usually called a mystic, but if we mean by a mystic a man who renounces the world known to our senses, denies himself, and strives through the darkness and the void to reach up to God, Sterry was no mystic. If, on the other hand, we

mean a man who is filled with pantheistic emotion by the visible world, who thinks most naturally in pictures, who refuses to define his faith, we admit that it would be desirable so to do, Sterry was a mystic. He was a poet who wrote in prose and Wordsworth would have claimed him as a brother.

Professor Pinto maintains that his prose may rank with Milton's, and prints many passages of which Milton would not have been ashamed; but Mr. Fraser Mitchell, in his *English Pulpit Oratory*, 299, notes his failure to maintain a uniform level of excellence, so that his beauties are only "occasional." There are many purple passages in Milton but no purple patches; but in Sterry, said Baxter, "his matter is not so much *cloathed* in Metaphors, as *drowned, buried* or *lost*." Milton was a man of the world, and when he wrote he had his readers in mind, he thought how some would glow with his eloquence, and others would be scorched by his invective. Sterry was an unworldly man, meditating by himself, writing for his own pleasure, and preaching to himself without a thought of his audience. Is it in consequence wonderful that a common-sense orator like Sir Benjamin Rudyard thought him woefully obscure?

After the Restoration he took pupils and prepared for them a short catechism. Here is the answer to the question: "What was Paradise?"

Paradise was the Similitude and Presence of God in the whole Creation. The Creation was a Garden: All the Creatures were Divine Flowers in this Garden, animated with a Divine Life, cloth'd with a Divine Beauty, breathing a Divine Sweetness. Every one did bear the Figure of, and answer to a Glory in the Face of God: The Face of God was a Sun, shining with all its Glories upon these Flowers, distilling its own Influence upon them, attracting their Sweetnesses to itself; descending into them, drawing them up into itself. Thus was the Divine Similitude, and the Divine Presence in the Creation, the Earthly Paradise; in the midst of Man stood this Paradise; in the midst of this Paradise Man walked.

Beautiful and characteristic, but imagine bewildered little boys attempting to memorise the answer, and the agony of the

author when they misplaced his words! It explains why Sterry as a teacher and preacher was not effective. Cromwell indeed admired him. There was a coarse streak of mysticism in his nature which enabled him to appreciate the gentleness and refinement of Sterry's beautiful mind. And Sterry adored Cromwell. He was so strong, so virile and so prompt in action. He came to think of him almost as God, or at least as "the express image of his person." For saying which Burnet called him a blasphemer—but Burnet was incapable of understanding Sterry.

H. MAYNARD SMITH.

Natural Law and the Theory of Society, 1500 to 1800. By OTTO GIERKE, with a Lecture on the Ideas of Natural Law and Humanity by E. TROELTSCH. Translated, with an Introduction, by ERNEST BARKER. (Cambridge University Press. 30s. 2 vols.).

To all serious students of the politics of the past the writings of Otto Gierke have long been familiar. They combine with their profound learning a deep insight into the past. F. W. Maitland was wont to declare that Gierke's "*Das deutsche Genossenschaftsrecht*" was the greatest book he had ever read, and he translated part of it, and accompanied his translation by an illuminating introduction. Professor Barker follows in the steps of a great Cambridge professor, and he clearly translates five of the sub-sections of Gierke's fourth volume which he also accompanies by an illuminating introduction. Our translator points out that though in a chronological sense, his is a complement to Professor Maitland's work, nevertheless it is a separate and independent book.

We wish very heartily to commend Professor Barker's translation, and in its form it is even an improvement on the German original. Gierke's deep thought sometimes expresses itself cumbrously, and the translator has been careful where there is a break in transition of thought or a new turn of argument to mark this break or turn by a division of the long paragraphs of the original. Now we have compared the original with this translation, and in so comparing it is at once evident how much the reader has been aided in grasping better

than before the complexities of Gierke's thought. Professor Barker has also added headings and sub-headings, both in the text and in the analytical summary; he has appended a brief marginal indication of the important notes; he has given foot-notes when a technical matter required elucidation; and he has indicated the books that have appeared since Gierke wrote in 1913, though now and then he seems to have missed some of these recent books. There is a list of authors cited from 1500 to 1650 and also from 1630 to 1800; and this list occasionally tells us the particular edition Gierke employed, for, as Professor Barker has found out, one of the difficulties in verifying Gierke's references is to ascertain the edition of the book he was using. The index errs in being distinctly short: it is barely six pages in length.

We have had the fourth volume of Gierke for over twenty years, and we are well aware of the comprehensive fashion in which he analysed and discussed natural law and the theory of society from 1500 to 1800. The only exception to this statement is that the analysis and the discussion of the share taken by the church before 1650 is slightly treated—slightly, that is, for Gierke—and he never completed what he meant to write on the church after 1650. Here are his words: "When we turn to conceptions of the church and its relations to the state, we find the natural-law theory of society exerting an overwhelming influence, and bringing under its spell, to an ever increasing degree, the whole of the literature of ecclesiastical law. The natural-law theory of the church may thus be appropriately treated, not as a separate theme, but in its connection with the positive-law doctrine (of churches and their rights) to be found in ecclesiastical law." Though this fourth volume was published in 1913, it had been written twenty years before, and the author was conscious of the gaps in it. Its appearance was due to the fact that its three predecessors were printed, and Gierke determined to print his fourth volume. When the war ended he had reached fourscore years, and had no heart to continue what he had begun. Here, then, is another of the many calamities the world war brought upon this. With the exception of the treatment of the place of the church—of course a weighty exception—this book is a complete and a comprehensive whole. We do not wonder at the declaration

of its author: "I do not believe that any other writer will soon again tread the paths I have taken. They lead, in part at any rate, through utterly desert regions." We have trodden some at least of these paths, and we freely confess that oases are few and the spaces between them are exceedingly great.

The school of natural law came once more into prominence during the sixteenth century, and did not die away—if it did die away—till the nineteenth century. It is a school that enjoys more than the nine proverbial lives of the cat, and there are many signs in our own generation that it is once again coming into its own. We detect an increasing number of references to it on the part of recent political philosophers, and even the newspapers are beginning to write of the rights of the natural man. There is, accordingly, a larger English public for this book than there would have been twenty years ago, and we heartily hope it will enjoy that large circulation to which it is eminently entitled.

Gierke feels the fascination not only of political thought but he also feels the fascination of the pedigree of political thought. For he realises as few have ever realised that the conceptions of the present are conditioned by the history of the past and by their history in the past. Though his book nominally begins with 1500, we are soon brought to realise how stoicism became part and parcel of the *jus naturale* of Rome; how this *jus naturale* entered the church as the absolute and the relative law of nature; how this absolute law reigned in Paradise and how the Fall of Adam transformed it into relative law; how the Fathers examined this transformation; how the Schoolmen in general and St. Thomas Aquinas in particular transformed this transformation; and how this double transformation meets us in 1500—is not all this plainly to be read in the pages of the two volumes before us? If the Renaissance was continually harking back to the classical writers, the political philosophers were also harking back to the men who examined and developed the idea of the law of nature. There is only one notable break in the history of political philosophy, and that occurred about the time of Cicero when men sought to turn the ideal equality of the law of nature into actual equality. The beginning of these far-reaching changes dates back to the age of Cicero, and its end is not yet. The French Revolution of 1789 saw one

form of it, the Russian Revolution of 1917 saw another, and what other forms we or our children may see are now hidden in the womb of time.

ROBERT H. MURRAY.

A New Argument for God and Survival. By MALCOLM GRANT.
(Faber and Faber. 12s. 6d.).

THE author of this most original book does not lack self-confidence. He boldly claims in the Introduction to be able to prove the truths of religion and solve the problem of the occult; and he persistently maintains that a reasonable person who is prepared to take the trouble to follow his line of argument, putting aside all prejudices, ought to be convinced. Short cuts to knowledge are admittedly the order of the day in the rush and bustle of this post-War world—but a short cut for the doubter to belief in Theism and the supernatural! What a vista lies before the honest unbeliever, what an armoury for the Christian teacher who, after long years of study and thought and prayer, still fails to convince the majority of those who seek his help. It seemed too good to be true: and most eagerly did we devour every page of Mr. Grant's *apologia*. Would the author turn out to be just another crank without adequate philosophical and scientific knowledge? Where would the "snag" turn out to be? We will not keep our readers in suspense. The book is enthralling, but not epoch-making, and surely there will be few who can accept all its conclusions. Mr. Grant's Deity is certainly not the God of the Christian church. Nevertheless the author deserves our respect and gratitude: he is a competent scholar and thinker, and states his case with singular force and persuasiveness. When we have read to the end we feel as if we knew him personally. He begins by discussing the theory of miracles. Science has no right to reject them on *a priori* grounds, but equally religion ought not to judge them on ethical grounds. The evidence in any given case is either sound or it is not, and a hundred witnesses can add nothing to the first-rate testimony of a few. In the author's view the fact of miracles, both bad and good, is abundantly proved. The man who denies their reality is a fool. The man who persists in regarding them as

due to natural laws yet to be discovered has not a shred of evidence to support him. "Are we to wait till the end of time for an explanation of how to turn water into wine, without preparation, and at a word?" (p. 43). We are told that the ablest investigators are completely baffled by the occult; over nearly a century no advance at all has been made in the attempt to bring its varied manifestations under any natural law; everything points to chaos or the opposite of law. The verdict of miracle does not compel us to abandon the inference of causes lying behind events; and the author argues from the miraculous to the existence of a cause which can be called God from its unity, power and personality. No miracle or alleged "revelation" is capable of conveying information or asserting truth which is not self-evident. The God who is capable of performing harmful miracles as well as useful ones is capable of deception as well as truth. A considerable part of the book is taken up with a lengthy consideration of occult phenomena (which, quite apart from the conclusions drawn, is very interesting), attributing a surprising number of events to direct divine intervention, including the phenomena which involve a suspension of the sensation of pain. As we read this section we thought of the strange tales we have heard of self-hypnosis among the fakirs in India. Were these experiences to be called miraculous? Mr. Grant gives us his answer: "Don't let us argue that [such phenomena] are not miracles because South Sea Islanders know how to walk about on burning embers! They *may* not be miracles, no doubt, but what is the best scientific judgement from the circumstances of the facts themselves?" (p. 192). Even the trance state in hypnotism "remains unaccounted for in terms of natural law" (p. 193). "We are up against magic, and can only be thankful that the issue is in the hands of God and not of the doctors" (p. 200). It is an interesting fact that a person under hypnosis refuses to respond to a suggestion which is contrary to his moral sense; but to quote this in the course of an attempt to explain hypnotic processes is, we are told, "nonsense." The fact only gives us a "very real contradiction, one which presents an insuperable bar to the supposition of a natural process" (p. 200). Of course spiritualistic materialisations are "miraculous," the direct work of our author's grotesque Deity;

and no finite spirit, he holds, is within the materialised form. Similarly ghosts are puppets created and operated by God. The supernatural results of various forms of "faith-healing" are fully admitted; but, whether at Lourdes or among Christian Scientists, they are not due to suggestion, but to divine intervention. This is alleged even in the often quoted case where Dr. Gibert cured a boy of warts by the use of blue and yellow water. There is no such thing as telepathy, but God, who knows the thoughts of A can, if he thinks fit, transmit them to the mind of B. From spiritualistic phenomena, the existence of a future life is argued, since "a lie on that scale is not credible from a benevolent deity" (p. 394): but the state is to be material, and some credence is given to the theory of reincarnation.

Mr. Grant rightly anticipates that the theologian will find his theories distasteful (and he is much too fond of brushing aside theology as unimportant or misleading; it is probably not a subject to which he has devoted much study)—but the theologian will assuredly be in good company. The author's theory of perpetual and often apparently irrational intervention on the part of a Deity whom he by no means shows to be beneficent outrages the thought of scientist, philosopher and theologian alike. The truth is that the scientific study of the occult is in its infancy, and we need not doubt that natural laws will be discovered which will explain much of the present apparent chaos, though even ultimately a residuum may be expected to remain which can only be described as miraculous. We may be confident however that this residue will not include such phenomena as hypnotism. One wonders how Mr. Grant's opinions would develop, if he were to be converted at least to the practice of sacramental Christianity. Complete absence of sacramental experience is the key to the weakness of the book; and the author's conception of our Lord is much what one would expect in view of his philosophy of God. He thinks that all right-minded men should see that Jesus was "a human being, chosen, inspired, guided, exploited, and in part deceived by God" (p. 417). And, apparently forgetful of the remark quoted above about the incredibility of divine falsehood on a large scale, he says: "There is certainly no limit to the deceit

of which God is capable, when he engages in intervention" (p. 414).

Mr. Grant believes that he is first in a field which in time will be very fully populated, and is confident that "any future enquiry will follow much the same lines and come to much the same conclusion as this present one" (p. 431). We hope that such enquiries will lead to belief in a less whimsical Deity, but all the same we have greatly enjoyed this vigorous book. As an antidote to it however, we suggest a careful perusal of Mr. Alfred Noyes' *The Unknown God*.

FREDERIC HOOD.

Civitas Dei. By LIONEL CURTIS. (Macmillan. 10s. 6d.).

FOR the writings of Mr. Lionel Curtis we entertain profound respect, for he belongs to that rare class of the man of thought who is also a man of action. Primarily he is a man of thought who has, through the stress of circumstances, been forced to become a man of action. He has, however, never ceased to be fascinated by the inner significance of the problems he has undertaken, say, in India and Ireland. At all costs he seeks a clue to the moral order of the world, and his *Civitas Dei* forms a notable and noble experiment in this direction. Naturally he has had many predecessors in his experiment. Polybius, Eusebius, St. Augustine, Orosius, Ibn Khaldun—a great Arabic attempt to write universal history—Bossuet, Condorcet, Leo, Laurent, Kant, Keller (or Cellarius), Johannes von Müller, Schlosser, Weber, Ranke, Weiss, Lindner—these are among the many men who have written the history of mankind. The perusal of their volumes forced men to the conclusion that the task of writing universal history is too much for any one man. Hence we have the plan of co-operative world histories of which the *Allgemeine Weltgeschichte* (begun in 1884), Oncken's *Allgemeine Geschichte*, M. M. Lavis and Rambaud's *L'Histoire Générale*, *The Cambridge Modern History*, and *The Cambridge Mediæval History* are well-known examples. The issue of these volumes has compelled men to reconsider the question of the impossibility of single-handed attempts to write the history of mankind. The reconsideration of this question has

of course been largely due to the failure of mass-production, even by experts, in the field of history. Once more one author is undertaking to survey the past, and we rejoice at this return to the practice of the past. Accordingly, we tender a warm welcome to Mr. Curtis's *Civitas Dei*, which begins with the earliest recorded history and comes down to the middle ages. Throughout this all-too-short survey the author seeks to discover a guiding principle in politics which largely resolves itself into the problem of the providential order of the world.

No review can deal justice to the conclusions of an arresting book. Whether we agree or disagree with the author's attitude to, say, the theology of the Christian Church, we are at all times stimulated by what he writes. It is obvious that no book of the age of Herodotus or Thucydides could conceive of a universal history while there was no political unity, no single dominant influence apparent in the world. Polybius witnessed the transformation of the particularism of the Greek into the cosmopolitanism of the Roman. The fall of the Roman Empire and the triumph of Christianity imparted a consciousness of the spiritual unity of the human race, a theme that rivets the attention of the author. Above all, Christianity introduced the deep-seated conviction that history was the fulfilment of divine purpose. There is no need to say how powerfully St. Augustine worked out this conviction in his *De Civitate Dei*. Mr. Curtis is free from the dualism running through this book; and he is an optimist, whereas St. Augustine is a pessimist. Secular history inspires the African Father with disgust and despair; such history inspires the author with what appears to be on the whole an orderly development. For the working out of this development we cordially commend the *Civitas Dei*.

ROBERT H. MURRAY.

Christianity and Class War. By NICHOLAS BERYAIEV. (Sheed and Ward, 1933. 3s. 6d. net).

PROFESSOR BERYAIEV is a distinguished Russian exile living in Paris. A Communist even before the Revolution, and owning (as he does in the dedication of this book) Karl Marx to have been "the social master of his youth," his aristocratic birth

doubtless combined with his return to Christian ideas to make him an uncongenial ally for the present régime at Moscow. The book, then, in part reflects the mind of an emigré, but it rises above the "common mentality" and "class judgements" which in an interesting passage (p. 16) he ascribes to the Russian emigration as an instance of "particular groups, products of exceptional circumstances," which have to be reckoned with in social psychology as well as the usual Marxian divisions by reference to production. He points out that many of the younger exiles who have become perforce a working-class, though showing the normal result of this experience in a hatred of the capitalist system, at the same time retain much of the outlook of a privileged class.

Accepting, therefore, in the main the theory of class-psychology, the whole theme of the book might be summarised thus: that "Class War" is a real factor, as far as it goes, which it is foolish either to condemn absolutely or shut our eyes to (as so many in England do); but that it does not go all the way as an explanation of human life, even in its social aspect, still less for ultimate issues.

"From the point of view of worth the human person is above the class, as he is above the State and above economics. A person as person does not belong to any class and is distinguished as bourgeois, noble, peasant, or proletarian only by accidental circumstances, by his 'wrapper': he belongs by his inner being to the spiritual world and to eternity" (p. 61).

The task of Christianity, then, is not to

"repudiate a class war. The point is that it [the class war] must be spiritualised: it must be kept in subordination to the supreme spiritual principle and away from the control of revengeful passions and relentless violence" (p. 83).

To that extent Professor Berdyaev falls into line with the essential quarrel of Christianity with the Marxian social philosophy, repudiating its Materialism, or (as it would be fairer to say) its Monism—for the philosophers of Moscow claim that they have room for "spirit" and "quality" in their system, and disavow now a merely "mechanistic" universe. But while giving a trenchant criticism of Marx's misconception

of human nature as nothing more than the raw material of the social edifice and his ignoring, to all intents and purposes, of man's spiritual side, this book, based on Russian experience, provides also a needed corrective to the shallow attacks on the Communistic principle in the names of "political liberty" and "religion," which are so rife in this country. In fact, the suppression of personality which is so fatal to true life and work in modern times is mainly attributable to the capitalist régime:

"The bourgeois spirit of Capitalism has branded the whole life of our age with a sinister mark; it even determines the socialists' movement itself, try as they do to disprove it."

In other words, the enmity to freedom of spirit and the hate exhibited in present-day Russia only evince the "negative dependence" so far of the new system on the old. As to the violation of supposed political freedom, the author emphatically relegates political rights to the third place in the hierarchy of degrees and values in social life:

"first of all, the according of primacy to spirit; then, economic considerations; and lastly, politics as the instrument of economics . . . Self-sufficient political vampirism exhausts human societies and builds a fictitious structure which, so far from serving life and vital interests, subjects them to its own. Hence it is that a self-denying ordinance in respect of politics is needful and an emergence of real spheres of spiritual and economic life indispensable" (p. 66).

While admitting, of course, that political freedom without economic and social freedom is a sham, some readers will not allow that there has always been such a complete severance of democratic politics from spiritual and economic realities as is here suggested.

However, the main hope of ultimate emergence from class war to true social life lies, we should all admit, with deeper forces than politics. Professor Berdyaev looks to the development of a "spiritual aristocracy" basing itself on love instead of class hatred. This development is the natural task of the

Christian church, for "in the depths of her consciousness the church in the beginning transcended and excluded classes, there are still no such things so far as she is concerned." But this is not to mean the reconciliation of the classes "based on the submissiveness of those who are oppressed and exploited" — "humility is not a social act, but a private and spiritual one."

"Social conflict is inevitable and will come about whatever else happens. It is not the business of Christianity to settle the technique and methods of this conflict, but to form the spiritual atmosphere of the souls who are engaged in it and to fight against that sinfulness which breeds a devilish rancour."

Above all,

"our fundamental business is this of *Man and of Class*. If Christianity takes sides with the working class in the social struggle she does not do so in the name of that class; it is in the name of man, of the dignity of the workman, in the name of his human rights and of his soul which Capitalism so grievously grinds down. There is a lot of difference between this and materialistic Socialism; if there is something of socialism in it, it is nevertheless strictly 'personalist': Christianity leads to individualisation rather than to collectivisation . . . But Christianity does not require individualisation only, it also calls for the conquest of individualism on behalf of the brotherhood of men" (pp. 116, 117).

Enough has been quoted to indicate the characteristic position taken up by Professor Berdyaev as to the relations between class war and Christianity. How far such a line of thought may give promise of a place to be found some day for Christian ideas in the Communist reconstruction of Russia it is hard to say. The present reviewer may be allowed to refer to a recent sociological conference in Oxford at which he heard the rival expositions of Professor Berdyaev and Dr. Julius Hecker (as spokesman for Moscow) on this point. There did not seem to be an unbridgeable divergence between the two points of view.

STEPHEN LIBERTY.

SHORT NOTICES.

The Call of Israel : an Introduction to the Study of Divine Election.

By W. J. PYTHIAN-ADAMS. (Oxford University Press).

"CAN it be denied that what not only the world, but the church herself in large measure needs to-day is the recovery of that profound conviction of God's overruling sovereignty, which crowns with an insoluble paradox the mystery of human free-will?" Thus asks Canon Pythian-Adams in the Introduction to his book; and the answer certainly is that it cannot be denied. When, further, the Canon points to "the clue which can conduct us safely through the labyrinth of our manifold perplexities," as contained in the words of St. Paul, "It is God which worketh in you both to will and to work, for his good pleasure," he has assuredly struck the true note. The object of this book is to illustrate from the history of Israel the truth of God's overruling guidance, while leaving to man the action of his free-will.

The thesis is worked out in an original and independent manner, and one's interest is held from beginning to end. Especially interesting is the *dénouement*, which is not such as would be expected; many will disagree with the writer's conclusions. We confess that we are not among them; we are grateful to Canon Pythian-Adams for the eloquent and convincing way in which he has set forth a truth which so many are slow to accept. "All things are of God. . . who worketh all things after the counsel of his will." If that is true, says the Canon, "there has been no moment in history, however tame or fleeting or insignificant which has not been touched by that hand or moulded to the working out of that Eternal Purpose."

The writer begins by dealing with the faith of the Psalmists, Prophets and Fathers of Israel; note the order, for which the writer has a special and sufficient reason. Then follows logically a critical discussion of the tradition in which faith was centred. The tradition on which the writer concentrates is the call of Israel out of Egypt and the subsequent events in the wilderness. This is followed by describing the guardians of the tradition when it was handed down. The examination of the basis of the tradition, which is next dealt with, is full of interest; and this is continued in the final section, where the miracles of Jordan and Horeb, the miracles of the plagues and the Red Sea, and the miracle of the Call, come under critical examination.

Canon Pythian-Adams is a convinced Higher Critic, and has obviously read widely ; with many points of detail most critics would disagree ; but that is neither here nor there ; the independence of thought and treatment is very refreshing.

This is decidedly a book to read.

W.O.E.O.

The Social Triumph of the Ancient Church. By S. J. CASE. (Allen and Unwin). 6s.

DR. CASE states the problem of the plight of the ancient world, examines the steps by which the Christian church endeavoured to redress it, and does this in the short compass of 237 pages. There is nothing in this book that the scholar has not long known, and our criticism of it was disarmed by the fact that the publishers announce that it is meant for the intelligent layman. If we read it from this angle, we can readily state that the author provides a convenient and useful analysis of what the ancient church undertook to carry out, and what it ultimately carried out. Dr. Case is not content with this task, for he proceeds to draw a moral. What is this moral ? It is this : "The most effective way to christianise the social order is to socialise the Christian religion." In plain words the church is urged to undertake the solution of international, national, civic, economic and industrial problems. This way lies disaster for the Christian church whose primary duty is to bring men and women into a right relationship with God. We sympathise with the seventeenth century preacher who was asked to address himself to the political problem of the times. "Brethren," was his reply, "there are so many considering the times. Let one poor man consider eternity."

R.H.M.

The Reformation in England : I. The English Schism, Henry VIII (1509-1547). By G. CONSTANT, formerly Member of the French Historical Institute in Rome ; Fellow of Liverpool University ; Docteur-ès-Lettres ; Professor at the Institut Catholique, Paris. Translated by the REV. R. E. SCANTLEBURY ; with a Preface by HILAIRE BELLOC. (London : Sheed and Ward). 16s.

THE title of this book is a sufficient indication of the author's standpoint. M. Constant is a Roman Catholic, evidently of somewhat ultramontane tendencies, and there is accordingly a marked simplicity about his main thesis : the Papacy was a notably

spiritual power, much concerned for the welfare of the English church and people, and Henry VIII was a bad king who led his subjects into the grave sin of schism. Nevertheless, this is a great achievement of scholarship. M. Constant knows, moreover, how to exercise restraint and how at the same time to write in a vivid style. His reading seems to have been exhaustive, and no industry has been spared in order to provide a thorough documentation. For every chapter there is a full and competently arranged bibliography, and these alone would make the book indispensable.

The divorce, we are told, was not the occasion but the cause of the "schism," and the necessity for it changed Henry from a potential friend to the most strenuous opponent of the Papacy. To secure his ends he had no need to pack Parliament, since the gentry and rich merchants, from whose ranks came the supply of members, were just those who were most anti-clerical in feeling. What the King did (perhaps at the instigation of Cromwell) was merely to play upon the strong passions already existing.

Having thus introduced his villain, M. Constant proceeds to give, in a chapter on the suppression of the monasteries, a dispassionate account of his worst act of villainy, which is so good that it surely leaves nothing more to be said on the subject. Then follow three chapters of biographical sketches. The author has three heroes, Fisher, More and Pole, and in writing of them he is perhaps at his best, combining scholarship with artistic skill. The villainy of Cromwell is brought into high relief, but none the less justice is done to his amazing competence. Cranmer is on the whole treated fairly, though there is some malice in the comment that he "slavishly ministered to the king's desires, and the royal will became his supreme law, and thenceforward his mission in life was the making and unmaking of the royal marriages." (p. 321). Dealing with the "Henricians" (Gardiner, Stokesley, Bonner and Tunstall) he does not appear to be quite at ease, and is obviously puzzled to know why there should have been such a group of "worthy men" who were "at once abettors of the schism and guardians of orthodoxy." Unqualified condemnation of the four bishops he feels to be out of the question; therefore he is led to make the suggestion that they gave support to the royal supremacy only in order to prevent Henry from falling under the influence of the advanced party and then allowing the introduction of German heresy. What he cannot tolerate is the idea that they might have resisted the papal supremacy because they were honestly convinced that it was a dangerous accretion to the ancient Catholic faith.

In the final chapter it is proved to demonstration that the Church of England under Henry VIII remained orthodox in dogma.

But the author's ultramontane bias is revealed in the assertion that "dogma under Henry VIII bears no relation to the dogma in Edward VI's or Elizabeth's time." (p. 393). It remains to be seen whether in a second volume of this work M. Constant can support that theory with adequate evidence.

A second appendix, the translation of two articles written in the *Révue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* and in *Mélanges Albert Dufourcq*, has been added to the English edition. "Could Clement VII annul Henry VIII's marriage?" it is asked; and the answer is given that he could not, because canon law forbade it, and because his own conscience would not permit him to swerve from the high principles of the Church of Rome. There was no weakness about his policy, and no surrender to political necessity. Rather was Clement a "keen psychologist" who realised the value of forbearance in dealing with one so passionate as Henry VIII. We can only remark, however, that the whitewash is thinly mixed.

G.S.W.

Calamy Revised. By A. G. MATTHEWS. (Clarendon Press : 1934). 40s.

To the Bampton Lectures of 1871 Canon Curteis added a footnote : "There is every reason to believe that unbiassed inquiry should strike off from Calamy's celebrated catalogue of '2,000 Confessors,' no less than 1,200 names." The unbiassed inquiry has taken place and Mr. A. G. Matthews tells us that 695 ministers were ejected in 1660, 932 in 1662, and 129 at uncertain dates. Of the 695 ministers, 290 had to make room for the rightful incumbents ; and of the 936, 220 were lecturers, assistants or attached to Chapels of Ease. Calamy had not classified his men, or noted when or why they were ejected. He had also made many mistakes, but he comes out of the inquiry much better than Canon Curteis anticipated.

Edmund Calamy, 1671-1732, was the son of an ejected minister and the grandson of a famous Puritan divine. In his childhood he knew many of the ejected ministers and heard the stories of their sufferings. In his manhood he strove to put on record the names of all those who had been ejected with such facts as he could discover. He wrote well and truthfully of those whom he had known personally and is accurate about facts within his own cognizance. He enquired diligently for information from many correspondents in different parts of the country, but was sometimes misled by their vague or defective memories, and was rarely in a position to test the truth of the facts supplied to him. He had little skill in arranging his material ; was rather prone

to believe that all his geese were swans ; and relied too much on what was said about them in funeral sermons. On the other hand he was an entirely honest man, and in an age of acute controversy wrote without bitterness or malice. In this he compares favourably with Walker, whose great work Mr. Matthews calls "a monumental piece of hate and patience." He compares also favourably with those nonconformist successors who have exploited his labours without being informed by his spirit.

Mr. A. G. Matthews has had many advantages denied to Calamy. He has had access to Diocesan, Parochial and University Registers, to State papers and to private diaries and letters, and to details accumulated by the industry of those who contribute to the historical societies of different sects. The result is that he has produced a book which it would be hard to overpraise, and which will be indispensable to all students of Nonconformity in the second half of the XVII century. His book is not a reissue of Calamy, but a new work based on Calamy. He has provided us with 2,500 biographies in alphabetical order. The biographies are written with almost as many abbreviations as there are in Crockford, references are duly supplied, and we only regret that unlike Crockford he does not give lists of publications. He has also supplied an *Index Locorum*, arranged under Counties, so that those studying the prevalence of dissent in special localities may easily discover the lives of the Confessors. Finally he has written an introduction which is a model for historical critics. It is lucid, admirably arranged, broadminded and convincing. We hope that some day, inspired by Mr. Matthews' example, some Churchman may write an equally good book called "Walker Revised." Mr. Tatham's Essay published in 1911 was a first step to such a goal.

H.M.S.

The Doctrine of God. By A. C. BOUQUET, D.D. (Heffer). 5s.

THIS is the seventh and last volume of the series of Modern Handbooks on Religion, on which Dr. Bouquet has been engaged for 5 years. In a foreword he replies effectively to various critics of earlier volumes. He then sums up the general argument of the series and gives reasons for the acceptance of Christian Theism as against the large variety of religious opinions which he has surveyed. There follows a lucid essay on the doctrine of God and the divine attributes deducible from Christian postulates. Finally he deals (but too briefly) with the means of grace and the theory of Christian worship. The contents of the former volume ("Jesus: A New Outline and Estimate"), which was recently noticed in these pages, would not lead us to expect

that Dr. Bouquet would believe in sacramental grace working *ex opere operato*. Actually he is somewhat elusive on the point, but we think it is safe to say that our expectations are realised. This may be illustrated by his treatment of Infant Baptism. "We are on safe ground when we say that the new birth which an infant undergoes at baptism is the new birth of admission into a spiritual society, a warm, loving and gracious fellowship, a wide family in which the little soul will be exposed to all kinds of helpful influences which will mould its character." (p. 139). We wonder if this really means anything at all. Would the child be less open to the helpful influences, if that ceremony, of which it was not intelligently conscious, had been omitted? But Dr. Bouquet proceeds to point out that even an infant is open to suggestion. "It would be hazardous to say that a reverent act of baptism could have no influence at all upon such plastic mental material, and that the goodwill of our Heavenly Father towards the infant could have less effect than that of the rays of the sun upon a flower." (p. 140). The same principle is applied to Holy Communion: the psychological value of the various means of grace is all the time emphasized. Nevertheless Dr. Bouquet gets rightly to the root of the matter when he points out that the test of various devotional practices (such as prayer before the tabernacle) must ever be the quality of the character which they produce. Dr. Bouquet sets immense value on the Eucharist (and even commends a devout Mayor who attends that service daily in preparation for his duties). We confess to finding this rather difficult to understand after reading Volume VI in the series. The publishers commend these volumes specially to Ordination candidates: and certainly every future priest would greatly profit by reading and digesting them. Nevertheless we are not sorry to know that the vast majority of ordinands will teach those committed to their care a more orthodox religion, whether on Catholic or Evangelical lines. We say this on no grounds of hide-bound traditionalism but because we are concerned for the salvation of souls. That Dr. Bouquet is at least equally concerned for this, we do not for a moment doubt, and his work has involved great industry on behalf of God, and his church. But, as we suggested in a former review, our opinion differs from Dr. Bouquet's about the existence of large potential congregations of "modern-minded" people. It is dogmatic sacramental religion which is saving souls—not merely of the ignorant, but also of those for whom Dr. Bouquet writes. And the apologetic of such writers as the contributors to "Essays Catholic and Critical" will assuredly "cut more ice" than the admittedly able series of volumes which Dr. Bouquet has now concluded.

F.H.

The Resurrection of the Body. By OSCAR HARDMAN, M.A., D.D. (S.P.C.K.). 2s. 6d. and 1s. 6d.

THIS book consists of the White Lectures delivered in St. Paul's Cathedral in 1933. Dr. Hardman is to be warmly congratulated, for the lectures are not only scholarly and lucid; they show a masterly grip on the all-important subject with which they deal, and are of great value apologetically at a time when more than any other article in the Creed that asserting belief in the *Resurrectio carnis* is open to attack. "If, as is certainly true, the resurrection of the body does not mean the reassembling of those material particles which were included in it at the moment of death or at some other particular time, what *does* it mean?" To this problem Dr. Hardman vigorously addresses himself. Perhaps the most usual restatement of the doctrine current to-day both among Liberal Evangelicals and Liberal Catholics is something like that of Dr. McNeile (quoted by Dr. Hardman on p. 25): "Christians—those who have already begun to share in the Resurrection life—are developing now a *morphe*, a form, an essence, a spiritual something, which is not identical with the inner Self or Ego, but is an element in the whole personality, which is at present germinally or potentially in the physical body. I think we may say that this growing *morphe* corresponds to what we mean by the spiritual body, which will finally emerge into complete and liberated activity out of the physical body." This view Dr. Hardman rejects as "modernist." His own alternative is extremely interesting and thought-provoking, and has the advantage of making specially clear the connexion between the Empty Tomb and our own resurrection. "The physical universe, which was once transformed in respect of a very small part of itself when our Lord's body rose again from the dead, is to be wholly transformed in like manner some day, when the consummation of the redemptive process which he then initiated is achieved." (p. 87). It is not merely that matter is to be transformed into energy, but judgement is allowed for—the material is to be transformed into the spiritual by the elimination of evil and perfecting of good. This view is very attractive, and solves many problems. The difficulty is to see how on this hypothesis the orthodox idea can be safeguarded that (in their bodies) "father, sister, child and mother" can "meet once more"; and in our opinion Dr. Hardman does not satisfactorily deal with this. Such an objection, he holds, is based upon a failure to appreciate the degree of unity which will exist among the faithful. The body which rises "forms a part of that whole body of glory which is to be added to the saints" (p. 94.) While adhering to all we have said in admiration of Dr. Hardman's lectures, we still feel that orthodoxy is better safeguarded by some such theory as that of Dr. McNeile; nor

have we ever before heard his opinions described as "modernist." It is quite possible to hold such a theory while still believing that in the waiting state before the general resurrection the departed are "disembodied spirits," and that it is at the resurrection that the spiritual body, which is organically continuous with the earthly body, springs into life. We also dissent from Dr. Hardman's view that the New Testament is on the side of conditional immortality and his consequent belief in annihilation of the lost. He is very severe with Dr. Charles with regard to the Empty Tomb, but here he agrees with him. Everyone should read Dr. Hardman's book, and no one will do so without interest and profit.

F.H.

The Fall of Man. Its Place in Modern Thought. By H. T. POWELL, D.D. With a Foreword by W. R. MATTHEWS, D.D. (S.P.C.K.). 5s.

THIS book purports to present a gospel that will grip the modern world and in particular the modern teacher of religion. An excellent object ; but here attempted by evacuating the doctrine of the Incarnation of much meaning, while the Atonement is left without any redemptive value. It seems to the writer that the fall of man is an illusion born of the foolish thinking of the past, and resulting in all sorts of barbaric ideas about God and his wrath ; as a result of course man has no real need of redemption at all. There never was a fall. Evil is to be regarded as only a present disobedience to "the divinity" in man. Baptism is, in the case of the infant, of no meaning except incorporation into the family of Christ. By thus denying the reality of the fall, by putting on one side the vast weight of Christian experience from S. Anselm to Bishop Gore, Dr. Powell presents a gospel to grip the modern teacher and give him something that will be easy to teach and make as little demand as possible upon the faith of his hearers.

We believe this book may be, as Dr. Matthews in his foreword says, worthy of attention, for it shows the great width of the gulf that lies behind this species of Pelagianism and the experience of thoughtful men in the past, and in the present too. In these days we would have thought it required great courage to deny that man is not as he should be, that human nature is fallen, that God's purpose has gone astray. We who believe in the sinfulness of human nature refuse to be called pessimists by Dr. Powell : we believe in the fall, but we believe, too, in the new creation of man in Jesus Christ, a creation into which we can by faith enter and be saved.

E.C.P.

This our Sacrifice. A brief Theological and Historical Study of the Eucharistic Oblation. By TREVOR JALLAND. (A. R. Mowbray, London and Oxford). 6s. net.

MR. JALLAND has three good qualities of a writer on a question of theology—learning, courage, and honesty; and the greatest of these is his honesty. He leaves himself and his reader so entirely at the mercy of the evidence that he will certainly fail to satisfy those who want round dogmatic assertion; and will not always reassure minds which are uneasy about the Church of England's position in the matter with which he is dealing. And it is exactly this frank recognising of facts and scrupulous moderation in the stating of conclusions which give its value to Mr. Jalland's book. There is no slurring of difficulties or making of dialectical points; and the reader feels assured that as far as Mr. Jalland will consent to carry him he is on firm ground.

Another point to be observed is the thoroughness with which he treats his subject. He begins by showing, how, in the Old Testament, "the conception of sacrifice rises from a non-moral to a purely ethical level in pace with the evolution of a moral idea of God": and finds his definition of sacrifice as "an act of giving to promote or preserve life," which is the basis of his whole argument. Applying this definition to the Sacrifice of Calvary, he maintains that the Lord's death must not be regarded as a detached event, or in itself the sole cause of man's salvation. The full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction is the eternal submission to the will of the Father, realised historically for us in the Incarnation, the Baptism, the Temptation, the Ministry, the Passion and the Crucifixion. Thus it is removed from the category of time, and relieved of theories of the Atonement which, dwelling exclusively on the death of Christ, represent it as an act of vicarious suffering, or forensic, or penal.

In Chapter III Mr. Jelland plainly tells the reader that "to take for granted even that the Eucharist rests upon the direct command of Jesus is to evade one of the hardest problems with which modern study has to deal." Mr. Jalland does not evade it; and examines the data as presented by modern study with severe impartiality; arriving at the conclusion that at the Last Supper our Lord did institute and command his church to continue the sacrament of the Eucharist. In the following chapters he studies historically the doctrine of sacrifice in the Eucharist in the New Testament, the Fathers, the Western Church, and the Church of England, with a fullness of detail which it is impossible to summarise; and concludes that part of his book with a valuable examination of the true nature of the Eucharistic oblation.

Some special consideration must be given to two chapters which refer to the past and present estate of the Church of

England. Mr. Jalland almost relentlessly dwells on the deplorable changes from the 1549 service to the form of 1552; and does not shrink from admitting that they give occasion, at least, to a candid Roman Catholic controversialist. Again he is plainly disturbed by the liturgical chaos and anarchy which have resulted from the unhappy experiment of Prayer Book revision and the subsequent episcopal action or inaction.

Not on the whole a book which closes the questions which it raises: but sincere and stimulating; and eminently calculated to make us examine afresh some conclusions which we had, perhaps too lightly, taken for granted.

J.H.F.P.

New Psychology and Old Religion. By EDWARD F. MURPHY, S.S.J., Ph.D. (Washbourne and Bogan).

THE object of this book is to show how religion can do all and far more than all that psychology attempts to do in helping the normal person to face and deal with the problems of life. Pathological cases do not come directly within its scope. The chapters deal with the everyday weaknesses and tendencies, which, if misdirected, lead to misery or tragedy. The book is more worth attention than the English reader may at first realise, because the combination of the American language and the Douai version, where quotations are made from Scripture, is irksome to those unaccustomed to either. The chapter headings and sub-headings are characteristically American, *e.g.*

Chapter I. We grow down—Religion draws us up.
Babies with Beards.
Emotional Infancy.
Little but Loud. etc.

These are doubtless intended to catch the imagination and retain the reader's interest. It is possible however that they may have a different effect on many readers of the *Church Quarterly Review*, and cause them to value the book less highly than it deserves. In order to encourage such readers to persevere, we will describe the contents of one short section of the book, and this will give a fair idea of what to expect. The paragraph entitled "Little but Loud" begins by pointing out that when a baby breaks a toy, he makes a fuss: silence at that age in the circumstances would be impossible. Adult babies behave similarly, *e.g.*, when they lose money on the Stock Exchange. Examples of such behaviour are then given from the Old Testament—Semei, Achitophel, Nabuchodonosor (*sic*). "But the Gospels offer a most dramatic type of the virtue opposed to such a spirit, and will keep

it vivid before men for all time ; a model of the very adulthood which the New Psychology seeks to attain for its enthusiasts. The Christ of Calvary, losing his following, his influence, his blood, his strength, his garments, his Mother, his beloved disciple, his life, is more sublime, if possible, than ever before. He rails against nothing and nobody. Though he has drunk his chalice of sorrow to the dregs, and his hands and feet are pierced, and all his bones are numbered, he not only forgives his tormentors, but even finds excuses for them. He is as superior to them in his silence and meekness as grace is superior to nature. He is our *Elder Brother*. He is *adult*. In all history and in all the annals of psychology, he ranks the best—the King—of losers.”

F.H.

EMIL BRUNNER: *Natur und Gnade. Zum Gespräch mit Karl Barth*. (Tübingen : J. C. B. Mohr. 1934). Price 1m. 50.

IN the previous issue of this *Review* (July, 1934), attention was drawn to the pamphlet in which Karl Barth sought to justify his *Reinigung* of the Dialectic Movement and his refusal to continue to co-operate with Emil Brunner. He denied that Brunner could any longer be considered an exponent of the “Theology of Crisis.” The pamphlet now before us is Brunner’s reply. In it, he seeks to prove that Barth’s accusations of “Neo-Thomism” and “Neo-Protestantism” are quite unwarranted. His own beliefs are derived neither from “Catholic” nor from “modern” sources, but from the Bible (*die Schrift*) and the Reformers. When, as in the title of his much discussed book, he had spoken of *Das Gebot-und-die Ordnungen*, the *und* was not, as Barth wrongly divined, “the *und* of co-ordination,” but “the *und* of problematics.” (p. 6.) Much of the pamphlet is taken up with an interesting discussion of the significance of the word *natura* in Calvin ; and Brunner proceeds to argue that his own account of the relations between nature and grace is more faithful to the Genevan ideal than that of Barth.

The one thing which emerges clearly from the discussion is that Brunner is at any rate nearer both to “Neo-Thomism” and “Neo-Protestantism” than is Barth. But the “concessions” which he makes towards the essential reasonableness of the Christian Faith are far from adequate. The pamphlet, like so much of contemporary German theological discussion, is unsatisfying, because both he and Barth are seeking to argue about a subject with which they have made up their minds in advance that reason is incompetent to deal. If God can be rightly described, as Brunner believes, as an anti-personal Person (*widerpersönliche*

Person, p. 11), then it is surely evident that what we mean by reason,—together with its corollary, the use of argument,—has no valid place in theology. No thoroughgoing Dialectical theologian can resort to controversy without implicitly betraying the first principles of his position.

F.L.C.

PERIODICALS.

The Journal of Theological Studies (Vol. XXXV. No. 139. July, 1934. Milford). Very Rev. J. A. Robinson : 'The Didache' [with additional Notes by Dom R. H. Connolly]. P. Gächter, S. J. : Codex D and Codex A. A. W. S. Porter : Studies in the Mozarabic Office. M. R. James : The Salomites. D. W. Thomas : The Root קרע in Hebrew. F. Bussby : A Note on שוה in Ps. cxxvii, 2. K. Budde : The Poem in 2 Kings, xix, 21-28 (Isaiah xxxvii, 22-29). Corrigendum, xxxv, 162. J. Oman : Oakeshott 'Experience and its Modes.' F. R. Tennant : Keeler 'The Problem of Error from Plato to Kant'; Walshe 'The Quest of Reality'; Marquardt 'Das Wunderproblem in der deutschen protestantischen Theologie der Gegenwart.' E. J. Rapson : Chalmers 'Buddha's Teachings.' R. E. Balfour : Owst 'Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England'; Chambers 'On the Continuity of English Prose from Alfred to More and his School.' W. R. Sorley : Nédoncelle 'La Philosophie religieuse en Grande-Bretagne de 1850 à nos jours.' F. C. Burkitt : Bakker 'A Study of Codex Evang. Bobbiensis (k).' G. R. D[river] : Danby 'The Mishnah.' A. C. Moule : Van den Wyngaert 'Studia Franciscana, I-II.'

The Churchman (Vol. XLVIII. No. 3. July, 1934. London, E.C.4. : Dean Wace House). The Oxford Conference of Evangelical Churchmen. C. M. Chavasse : The Ministry of Reconciliation and the Present Distress. J. C. Neill : The Forgiveness of Sins. C. J. Offer : The Confessional in History. W. H. Mackean : The Prayer Book and Confession. S. M. Warner : The Ministry and Reconciliation. S. Nowell-Rostron : Christian Assurance. W. E. Chadwick : A "City" without the "Foundations." [Reviews Curtis 'Civitas Dei']. R. S. Cripps : Cunningham 'The New Testament . . . translated'; Kenyon 'Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible.' Hughes 'The New Psychology and Religious Experience.' Keller 'Karl Barth and Christian Unity.' Fleming 'Evolution or Creation?' Rogers 'Modes of Faith.' Radhakrishnan 'East and West in Religion.' Grubb 'C. T. Studd, Cricketer and Pioneer.'

Laudate (Vol. XII. No. 46. July, 1934. Burnham, Bucks : Nashdom Abbey). D. Bailey : In Monte Sancto. V. A. Demant : Ernst Troeltsch. F. A. M. Spencer : The Problem of Evil. H. C. Bell : The Sacrament of Marriage. G. A. C. Stratton : On Saying the Breviary. The Late Lord Halifax. E. L. Mascal : Barnes 'Scientific Theory and Religion.' (critical). W. L. Knox : Mackinnon 'The Gospel in the Early Church.' C. L. Faithfull : Carpenter 'The Church and Politics'; Spencer (ed.) 'The Meaning of the Groups.' Hughes 'The New Psychology and Religious Experience.' Ghéon 'The Secret of the Little Flower.' G. A. C. Stratton : Fr. Jerome 'A Catholic Plea for Reunion.' Cabrol 'St. Benedict.'

The Congregational Quarterly (Vol. XII. No. 3. July, 1934. London, E.C.4. : Memorial Hall). W. B. Selbie : Robert F. Horton. C. J. Cadoux : 'The Doctrine of the Church in the Light of Christian History. A. Watson : The Faith of a Business Man. T. H. Hewes : A Barthian before Barth. [Dr. P. T. Forsyth]. G. Lang : The State and the Young Offender. F. J. Powicke : Thomas Campbell Finlayson. R. E. Thomas and F. H. Ballard : 'Sharing.' A. Peel : A Little Bit of England. A. E. Garvie : Dibelius 'Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums.' T. W. Manson : Torrey 'The

Four Gospels.' A. J. Grieve: Ratcliffe 'St. Paul and his Writings'; Lake 'Paul, His Heritage and Legacy.' W. B. Selbie: Osborn 'Schleiermacher and Religious Education'; Söderblom 'The Nature of Revelation'; Flew 'The Idea of Perfection.' R. S. Franks: Grant 'A New Argument for God and Survival'; Turner 'Essentials in the Development of Religion'; Keeling 'Descartes'; Laird 'Hobbes.' A. C. Underwood: Nock 'Conversion.' S. Carr: Macnicol 'The Living Religions of the Indian People.'

The Journal of Religion (Vol. XIV. No. 3. July, 1934. Chicago University Press). J. S. Bixler: The Patriot and the Pragmatist. R. Suter: The Concept of Morality in the Philosophy of Jonathan Edwards. D. F. Ehlman: Correcting Subjectivism in Religion. E. C. Colwell: The Fourth Gospel and the Struggle for Respectability. W. C. Graham: Recent Light on the Cultural Origins of the Hebrews. G. W. Sarvis: Missions, Culture, and Social Change. J. B. Pratt: Thomas 'The History of Buddhist Thought' ('excellent'). W. C. Graham: Eichrodt 'Theologie des A.T., I.' E. W. Parsons: Oesterley 'II Esdras.' H. E. Allen: Torrey 'The Jewish Foundations of Islam.' A. Walther: Van Selms 'De Babylonische Termini voor Zonde.' M. S. Enslin: Zeitlin 'The History of the Second Jewish Commonwealth Prolegomena.' I. G. Matthews: Goodspeed and Smith 'The Short Bible.' S. C. Tornay: Lercher 'Institutiones Theologiae Dogmaticae, 2nd edit.' (favourable). R. L. Calhoun: Marquardt 'Das Wunderproblem in der deutschen protestantischen Theologie der Gegenwart'; Adams Brown 'God at Work.' E. E. Aubrey: Wobbermin 'The Nature of Religion.' P. H. Eller: Sessler 'Communal Pietism among Early American Moravians.' K. H. Cousland: Silcox 'Church Union in Canada.' H. S. Dimock: Jung 'Modern Man in Search of a Soul.' S. B. Freekof: Waxman 'History of Jewish Literature II. from the Twelfth Century to the Middle of the Eighteenth.' H. R. Willoughby: Nock 'Conversion.'

The Jewish Quarterly Review (Vol. XXV. No. 1. July, 1934. Macmillan). J. C. Sloane, jr.: The Torah Shrine in the Ashburnham Pentateuch (illustrated). L. Finkelstein: An Attempted Systematization of Rabbinic Theology. P. Chertoff: History of Halakic Literature. S. Zeitlin: Judaism and Christianity. D. S. Blondheim: The 'Ecole Rabbinique' of France. B. Heller: Ginzberg's Legends of the Jews, II. Levy 'Der Sabbath in England.' Bension 'The Zohar in Moslem and Christian Spain.' Abrahams and Stokes 'Starrs and Jewish Charters preserved in the British Museum.'

The Expository Times (Vol. XLV. Nos. 9-11. June-August, 1934. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark). T. Yates: I Peter. J. Moffatt: Letters to Women on the Christian Faith—Abailard and Héloïse. F. W. Dillistone: Certain Contrasts between Fundamental Ideas in Hinduism and Christianity. A. J. Westlake: The Ministry of Heresy. D. R. Fotheringham: Acts xi, 20. Adams Brown 'God at Work.' Woolley 'Ur Excavations, II.' Gowen 'History of Religion.' Hardman 'The Resurrection of the Body.' T. H. Robinson: Isaiah xl-lxvi. A Fresh Discussion. July. V. Taylor: II Peter and Jude. J. McConnachie: Natural Religion or Revelation? E. C. Blackman: Marcion. J. I. Hasler: The Incident of the Syro-Phoenician Woman (Matt. xv, 21-28; Mark vii, 24-30). C. J. Cadoux: The Dates and Provenance of the Imprisonment Epistles of St. Paul. M. Frost: 'I also am a Man under Authority.' McDougall 'Religion and the Sciences of Life.' Söderblom 'The Nature of Revelation.' Flew 'Idea of Perfection in Christian Life.' Easton 'The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus.' Webb 'Religion and Theism.' J. Moffatt: Recent Foreign Theology. The Centenary of Wm. Carey. August. Very Rev. J. G. Simpson: The Letters of the Presbyter. J. S. Weale: Montanus. J. G. Riddell: Pessimism and Humanism. G. P. Thomas: The Venerable Bede, Christian Saint and Hero. A. Souter: Codex 2400. J. Steele: The Patriarchal Narratives. J. H. Hertz: Num.

xxiii, 9b, 10. T. H. Gaster : 'Fortune.' A Correction [To *E.T.*, Dec., 1933]. A. Abbott : Was Moses the meekest of Men ? J. J. Johnstone : The Prayer of St. Chrysostom. J. D. Smart : Karl Barth and Other-worldliness. P. Boynton : When He Comes. L. M. Rogers : 1 John i, 9. J. Moffatt : Recent Foreign Theology. J. W. Jack : Recent Biblical Archaeology.

The Quarterly Review (No. 521. July, 1934. John Murray). Capt. E. Altham, R.N. : Sea, Air, and Empire. Sir A. Macphail : The Short Story. C. Davison : The Periodicity of Earthquakes. Sir C. S. Addis : Canada and its Banks. J. L. Hammond : The Age of Creevey. D. S. MacColl : Books on English Art. R. Hart-Synnot : Tithe Rent-Charge. G. M. Harper : Samuel Taylor Coleridge. E. S. Haldane : Edward Irving. H. Molson, M.P. : The Problems of Malta. Water Supplies and the Drought. Viscount Cranbourne, M.P. : Conservatism and the National Government. Trevelyan 'The Peace and the Protestant Succession.' Houssaye 'The Return of Napoleon [E.T.].' Nicolson 'Curzon and the Last Phase.' Spengler 'The Hour of Decision.' Granville-Barker and Harrison 'Companion on Shakespeare Studies.' Dawson 'A Leech-book.' Fr. Jerome 'A Catholic Plea for Reunion.' Grant 'A New Argument for God and Survival' (critical).

The English Historical Review (Vol. XLIX. No. 195. July, 1934. Longmans). Charles James Longman. T. A. M. Bishop : The Distribution of Manorial Demesne in the Vale of Yorkshire. W. A. Morris : The Date of the 'Modus Tenendi Parliamentum.' [After 28 June, before 29 July or 14 August, 1321]. G. Lapsley : The Parliamentary Title of Henry IV, Part I. L. S. Sutherland : Lord Shelburne and East India Company Politics, 1766-9. G. Barraclough : Bernard of Compostella. S. B. Chrimes : 'House of Lords' and 'House of Commons' in the XVth Century. H. Beeley : A Project of Alliance with Russia in 1802. H. E. Howard : Lord Cowley on Napoleon III in 1853. A. Hamilton Thompson : Coulton 'Scottish Abbeys and Social Life' (3½ pp. critical). F. M. Powicke : Limouzin-Lamothe 'La Commune de Toulouse'; Painter 'William Marshal'; Rees 'Historical Map of S. Wales and the Border in the XIVth Century.' J. Tait : Weinbaum 'London unter Edward I u. II.' J. B. Black : Read (ed.) 'Bibliography of British History, Tudor Period, 1485-1603. C. M. Ady : Richards 'Florentine Merchants in the Age of the Medici.' J. E. Neale : Brugmans 'Correspondentie van Robert Dudley Graaf van Leycester, I-III'; Mathew 'The Celtic Peoples and Renaissance Europe.' R. N. C. Hunt : Michaelis 'Richard Hooker als politischer Deuter'; D'Entrèves 'Ricardo Hooker.' N. Sykes : Trevelyan 'England under Q. Anne. Ramillies.' W. M[iller] : Aslan-Macler 'Etudes historiques sur le Peuple arménien.' E. F. J[acob] : Swartwout 'The Monastic Craftsman.' Halphen et Sagnac (ed.) 'Peuples et Civilisation, VII. La Fin du Moyen Age.' E. C. L[odge] : Billard 'Jehanne D'Arc et ses Juges.' C. M. Ady : Rodocanachi 'Les Pontificats d'Adrien VI et de Clément VII (1522-34).' P. E. R[oberts] : Foster 'England's Quest of Eastern Trade.' J. H. C[apham] : Dodd 'The Industrial Revolution in N. Wales.' W. H. V. R[ead] : Macdonald 'Authority and Reason in the Middle Ages' (very critical).

Nouvelle Revue Théologique (Vol. LX. Nos. 6-10. Vol. LXI. Nos. 1-4. June, 1933. April, 1934. Louvain : 11, rue des Récollets). F. M. Braun : La Passion de N.S. Jésus-Christ, d'après S. Jean, III. A. Gemelli : De l'Avortement indirect, (No. 7, II. No. 8, Encore l'Avortement indirect). J. Calès : L'Agriculture en Palestine. R. Thibaut : Le Signe de Jonas. G. Delannoy : Pour l'Etude de la Philosophie allemande contemporaine. A. Debil : Meyenberg 'Leben-Jesu-Werk' [3,298 pp.!] J. Levie : Pallis Notes on St. Mark and St. Matthew; Dodd 'Romans'; Manson 'The Teaching of Jesus'. J. Calès : Allo 'L'Apocalypse.' No. 7. A. Vermeersch : Avortement direct ou indirect. (No. 8 Une courte conclusion). J. Creusen :

Le Voeu du plus parfait. L. Malevez : Boulgakoff 'L'Orthodoxie' ('un petit livre plein de pensée'). M. Ledrus : Andrews 'What I owe to Christ.' No. 8. P. Galtier : L'Age de Confirmation. J. B. Lenain : Beauraing. J. de Ghellinck : Ehrhard 'Die Kirche der Märtyrer.' A. de Bil : Salembier 'Le Cardinal Pierre D'Ailly'; Causin 'Nine Martyr Monks.' E. de Moreau : Polman 'L'Element historique dans la controverse religieuse du XVIIe Siècle' (620 pp.); Coste 'Monsieur Vincent, I-II' (1,322 pp.). No. 9. A. van Hove : Le Concordat entre le Saint-Siège et l'Etat de Bade. M. Consette : Les Directeurs spirituels de Démétriadé. Episode de la Lutte antipélagienne. R. Plus : La Femme, la Direction, les Lettres de Direction. C. Martin : Staab 'Pauluscommentare . . . aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt'; Casey 'Serapion of Thmuis Against the Manichees.' Eichrodt 'Theologie des A.T.' (very favourable). Gaster 'Samaritan Eschatology.' J. de Ghellinck : Burkitt 'Church and Gnosis.' C. Martin : Ussani 'Hegesippi . . . Historiae Libri V.' No. 10. J. de Levie : Per Jesum Christum Filium tuum. A. Wuyts et A. Hayen : Le Communisme et l'Antireligion. R. Brouillard : Bonne Aventure et Clairvoyance parisiennes. E. Bergh : Réforme des Indulgences et Soulagement des Ames du Purgatoire. J. Levie : Kittel 'Theologisches Wörterbuch zum N.T.'; Taylor 'Formation of the Gospel Tradition'; Colwell 'The Greek of the Fourth Gospel'; Williams 'Talmudic Judaism and Christianity.' Vol. LXI. No. 1. (January, 1934). J. de Ghellinck : Lectures spirituelles dans les Ecrits des Pères, I. (II, No. 2). L. Malavez : Le Corps mystique du Christ. A. Hanin : Le Chant des Fidèles. Sa Place dans le Mouvement liturgique, son Organisation. J. Creusen : Les 'Faits merveilleux' de Belgique. J. Calès : Prat 'Jésus-Christ.' J. Abendt : L'Action sacerdotale dans les Organisation souvrières. L. Malevez : Raaft 'Der Ursprung des Katholischen Traditionsprinzips.' J. de Ghellinck : Jugie 'Theologiae dogmaticae Graeco-russorum Expositio.' No. 2. J. Bonsieven : Les Espérances messianiques en Palestine au Temps de Jésus-Christ, I (II, No. 3). A. van Hove : Le Concordat entre le Saint-Siège et le Reich allemand. L. de Coninch : Nous Prêtres et le Cinéma. M. Claeys-Bouuaert : Catéchisme dominical et Année liturgique. E. de Clipele : Le Week-end Spirituel. J. de Ghellinck : Sikes 'Peter Abailard' (laudatory); Glorieux 'Répertoire des Maîtres en Théologie de Paris au XIIIe Siècle'; Wilmart 'Analecta Reginensia.' F. Jansen : Wilmart 'Auteurs spirituels et Textes dévots.' No. 3. In Memoriam. Le Roi Albert. H. de Lubac : Remarques sur l'Histoire du Mot 'Surnaturel,' I (II, No. 4). P. Peeters : Le Secret Professionnel. P. Dohet : Au Chevet des Malades.' F. Jansen : Mediaevalia, I (II, No. 4.) J. Levie : Box 'Judaism in the Greek Period'; Scott 'Living Issues in the N.T.'; Grant 'The Growth of the Gospels'; Goguel 'La Vie de Jésus,' No. 4. R. Carpentier : Mirabilis reformasti. F. Lelotte : L'Organisation dans l'Action catholique. J. Sontag : Mysteres antiques et Rites religieuses des Primitifs. G. Sauvage : La J.O.C. conquérante. P. Charles : L'Oraison pour le Roi. A. de Bil : Delehave 'Les Origines du Culte des Martyrs, 2nd edit.' G. Dirks : Butler 'Ways of Christian Life.'

Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique (Vol. XXX. No. 3. July, 1934. Louvain: 40, rue de Namur). P. Galtier : A propos de la Pénitence primitive. Méthodes et Conclusions, I. L. Gougoud : La Société lettrée de Londres observée par un Ecrivain français en 1839. Journal inédit de François Rio, II. G. Mollat : Les Débuts de l'Occupation française à Rome en 1849, d'après une correspondance inédite, II. A. de Meyer : Ghellinck 'Les Exercices pratiques du 'seminaire' en Théologie'; Heimbucher 'Die Orden u. Kongregationen der Katholschen Kirche, II, 3e édit.' (critical.) J. de Ghellinck : Streeter 'The Chained Library' (3 pp. laudatory); Mohlberg 'Katalog der HSS. der Zentralbibliothek Zurich, I'; Mohrwann 'Die altchristliche Sonder-sprache in den Sermonen des hl. Augustinus, I' (laudatory); Van den

Wijngaert 'Sinica Franciscana, II' (laudatory). J. Coppens: Van der Leeuw 'Phänomenologie der Religion' (6 pp.). W. Peremans: Dreieux 'Cultes indigènes des Lingons,' L. Certaux: Kenyon 'The Chester Beatty Papyri' (3 pp.). R. Draguet: Lagrange 'Histoire ancienne du Canon du N.T.' (7 pp. critical); Spinka 'History of Christianity in the Balkans'; Mingana 'Woodbrooke Studies, VII.' A. Charue: Holzmeister 'Chronologia Vitae Christi.' R. Maere: Barnes 'The Martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul'; 'La Basilica di Aquileia' (3½ pp.). J. Lebon: Bonner 'A Papyrus Codex of the Shepherd of Hermas' ('édition vraiment modèle'); Geiselmann 'Die Abendmahlslehre und der Wende der christlichen Spätantike zum Frühmittelalter. Isidor von Sevilla u. das Sakrament der Eucharistie' (favourable). J. Cottiaux: Macdonald 'Authority and Reason in the Early Middle Ages' (critical); Englhardt 'Die Entwicklung der dogmatischen Glaubenspsychologie in der mittelalterlichen Scholastik' (5 pp. favourable); Guichardan 'Le Problème de la Simplicité divine . . . au XI^e et XV^e siècles.' P. David: Kutrzeba (ed.) 'Historja Slaska' (4½ pp.); Stasiewski 'Untersuchungen über drei Quellen zur ältesten Geschichte u. Kirchengeschichte Polens' (3½ pp.); Kutrzeba and Semkowicz 'Akta Unji Polski z Litwa, 1385-1791.' A. Villien: Arquillière 'S. Grégoire VII. Essai sur sa conception du Pouvoir pontifical' et 'L'Augustinisme politique.' P. Debongnie: Mulder 'Gerardi Magni Epistolae.' E. Vansteenbergh: Heimpel 'Dietrich von Niem *Dialog über Union u. Reform der Kirche, 1410*' (favourable). G. Constant: Read (ed.) 'Bibliography of British History, 1485-1603'; Rodocanachi 'Histoire du Rome, 1513-34.' D. van den Eynde: Dufourcq 'Le Concile de Trente, 3e édit.' P. Polman: Schornaum 'Quellen zur Geschichte der Wiedertauffer, II'; Doelle 'Vertreibung der Franziskaner aus Altenbuch u. Zwickau.' A. Leman: Linhartova 'Epistulae et Acta Antonii Caetani, 1607-11, I.' P. Melchior: Jacobs 'Die rheinischen Kapuziner, 1611-1725.'

Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift (Vol. XXIV. No. 12. January-June, 1934. Bern: Stämpfli et Cie). L. Winterswyl: Das Eucharistische Hochgebet der altkatholischen Liturgie. W. Küppers: Das Messiasbild der spätjüdischen Apokalyptik. Die Interkommunion mit der Kirche von England. Stepun 'Das Antlitz Russlands u. das Gesicht der Revolution.' Visser 't Hooft 'Le Catholicisme non-romaine.' Stöckert 'Bibliothek der Kirchenväter. General-register zu Band 1-61.' No. 2 (April-June). R. Keussen: Naturrecht, Staat u. Kirche in ihrem Verhältnis u. ihrer Begrenzung. C. Neuhaus: Die Gnadenlehre in der orthodoxen morgenländischen Kirche. Briefwechsel zwischen dem Präsidenten des Oekumenischen Rates für Praktisches Christentum, des Bischofs von Chichester mit dem Reichsbischof Ludwig Müller. Die spanische u. portugiesische reformierte Kirche.

The Church Overseas (Vol. VII. Nos. 26-27. April-July, 1934. Westminster, S.W.1, Church House: Press and Publications Board). A. G. Fraser: The Selection of Missionaries. Right Rev. N. B. Hudson (Bishop of Labuan and Sarawak): Vocation and Missionary Vocation. T. D. Sully: The Lindsay Commission Plan and an Indian College [St. John's College, Agra]. H. St. J. Evans: Marriage Problems in W. Africa. S. Neill: An Indian Ministry at Work. The Educational Work of Communities (By a Sister, C.R.). R. E. Doggett: The C.M.S. News from the Dioceses. A Quarterly Survey. F. Melland: J. Merle Davis 'Modern Industry and the African.' J. W. W. Smith: Hon. H. A. Wyndham 'Native Education' Ceylon, Formosa, the Philippines, French Indo-China and British Malaya.' H. U. W. Stanton: Browne 'The Eclipse of Christianity in Asia.' A. F. Matthew: Walker 'The Abyssinian at Home.' C. H. S. Matthews: Johnstone 'Samuel Marsden.' G. A. Gollock: Cable and French 'Something Happened.' Sir C. Walton: Davies 'A Chaplain in India.' C. A. Alington:

Garlick 'Pioneers of the Kingdom, II.' W. O'Connor : 'Hospitals Overseas, Africa and the East Series.' J. K. Sturge : Fr. Andrew 'My Year in Rhodesia.' July. L. E. Browne : Missionary Work among the Muslims of the E. Indies. W. K. L. Clarke : 'Rethinking Missions.' Literature. P. L. Garlick : A Century of Progress in Women's Work. Right Rev. E. Woods (Bishop of Croydon) : The Uganda Church To-day. J. E. Levo : The Centenary of Slav Emancipation. R. Rouse : The Unified Statement : its Functions in the Church. C. H. Gill : Anglican Missionary Societies, IV. The C.M.S. News from the Dioceses. Quarterly Survey. H. O. Savile : Mair 'An African People in the Twentieth Century.' W. B. Suter : Laws 'Reminiscences of Livingstonia.' Right Rev. H. Whitehead : Pickett 'Christian Mass Movements in India.' W. W. Cash : Armstrong 'Lord of Arabia. Ibn Saud.' W. M. Chambers : Richter 'Tanganyika and its Future.' O. R. M. Roxby : McLeish 'Jesus Christ and World Evangelization.' R. R. Williams : Read 'The Land and Life of India.'

BOOKS RECEIVED.

BIBLICAL AND HISTORICAL.

- CONSTANT, G.—*The Reformation in England*, 529 pp. (Sheed and Ward). 16s. See Review.
 HULL, R.—*Medieval Theories of the Papacy*, 256 pp. (Burns and Oates). 7s. 6d.
 FOAKES-JACKSON, F. J.—*The Church in the Middle Ages*, 153 pp. (Cambridge Univ. Press). 7s. 6d.
 GARDNER, P., and FOAKES-JACKSON, F. J.—*The Expansion of the Christian Church*, 368 pp. (Cambridge Univ. Press). 7s. 6d.
 HOPKIN-JAMES, L. S.—*The Celtic Gospels*. 278 pp. (Oxford Univ. Press). 30s.
 WATMOUGH, J. R.—*Orphism*, 80 pp. (Cambridge Univ. Press). 3s. 6d.
 VAUGHAN, F. D.—*Five Centuries of Catholic Witness*, 158 pp. (S.P.C.K.). 5s.
 LUNT, W. E.—*Papal Revenues in the Middle Ages*, 341 & 658 pp. (Milford). 63s.
 WOOD-LEGH, K. L.—*Studies in Church Life in England under Edward III*, 181 pp. (Cambridge Univ. Press). 10s. 6d.
 RICHARDS, G. C.—*A Concise Dictionary to the Vulgate New Testament*, 130 pp. (Bagster), 5s.
 VIDLER, A. R.—*The Modernist Movement in the Roman Church*, 286 pp. (Cambridge Univ. Press). 12s. 6d.
 ROYDS, T. F.—*The Epistles and Gospels*, 106 pp. (Blackwell), 2s. 6d.

THEOLOGICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL.

- BERESFORD, J. P.—*The Case for Faith-Healing*. 186 pp. (Allen and Unwin). 5s.
 BESTERMAN, T.—*Inquiry into the Unknown*, 142 pp. (Methuen). 3s. 6d.
 BOX, H. S.—*The World and God*, 208 pp. (S.P.C.K.). 7s. 6d.
 BETHUNE-BAKER, J. F.—*Unity and Truth in the Church of England*, 32 pp. (Cambridge Univ. Press). 1s.
 STRONG, E. L.—*The Revelation of the Holy Spirit*, 234 pp. (S.P.C.K.). 6s.
 HENSON, H. H.—*Unitarianism or Historic Christianity?* 50 pp. (Oxford Univ. Press.) 1s.
 HAMEL, A.—*Der junge Luther und Augustin*, xvi+349 pp. (Bertelsmann). 13.20 r.m.

- DAKIN, A. H.—*Von Hugel and the Supernatural*, 273 pp. (S.P.C.K.).
12s.
HENDERSON, G. D.—*Mystics of the North East*, 267 pp. (Third Spalding Club). 21s.
WIGHTMAN, W. P. D.—*Science and Monism*, 416 pp. (Allen and Unwin).
15s.
WIGLEY, T. —*A New Highway*, 272 pp. (Allen and Unwin.) 8s. 6d.
WHITTAKER, T.—*Reason*, 217 pp. (Cambridge Univ. Press). 10s. 6d.
MARTIN, A. D.—*The Holiness of Jesus*, 251 pp. (Allen and Unwin).
10s. 6d.

SERMONS, ETC.

- MENZIES, K.—*Addresses to 'Christian Minor,'* 171 pp. (S.P.C.K.).
4s.
GAMBLE, M.—*This above All*, 91 pp. (Allenson), 2s.
INSKIP, J. T.—*Confirmation and After*, 125 pp. (Skeffington), 2s. 6d.
ASHBY, L. B.—*More Little Sermons*, 160 pp. (Skeffington). 3s. 6d.
LANGHORNE, H. E.—*More Favourite Hymns*, 191 pp. (Skeffington).
3s. 6d.
ALINGTON, C. A.—*In Season and Out of Season*, 160 pp. (Skeffington).
3s. 6d.
FLINT, B.—*Talks on Confirmation*, 64 pp. (Skeffington). 1s. 6d.
RUDKIN, E. H.—*In Quest of the Divine*, 268 pp. (Skeffington). 6s.

VARIOUS.

- BOLTON, G.—*The Trageay of Gandhi*, 326 pp. (Allen and Unwin).
10s. 6d.
BRALEY, E. F., and PETITPIERRE, M. C.—*The State and Religious Education*, 160 pp. (S.P.C.K.). 3s. 6d.
LAURIE, A. P.—*Pictures and Politics*, 184 pp. (International Publishing Co.). 6s.
PIPER, O.—*Recent Developments in German Protestantism*, 159 pp. (S.C.M.) 4s.
NYGREN, A.—*The Church Controversy in Germany*, 115 pp., (S.C.M.).
2s. 6d.
INGE, W. R.—*Vale*, 127 pp. (Longmans). 3s. 6d.
DAVIES, LORD.—*Force*, 242 pp. (Benn). 21s.
THORBURN, P. B.—*The Jewel of Truth*, 127 pp. (Skeffington). 2s. 6d.
McCULLOUGH, P. G.—*Thirty Years in the Wilderness*, 256 pp. (Rider).
7s. 6d.

